

The Classical Review

MARCH 1910

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

A NEW DEVELOPMENT OF THE CLASSICAL QUESTION.

THE new development to which I refer is Mr. Snow's proposal, advocated with ability and received with cordiality, viz. that we should discontinue Latin prose and so find time for Greek. A large part of the pamphlet, *How to Save Greek*, is occupied with suggestions which concern University examinations. Many of these are interesting and important: some, I confess, strike me as rather visionary, but I wish to leave on one side all that do not directly concern the school age of boys, and consider in particular the opinion that composition in Greek or Latin should be confined to a very small and select minority. (How select, may be gathered from the last sentence on p. 17.)

It is needless to express agreement with much that is urged in defence of this proposal. Mr. Snow laments over the heinous ignorance shown by youths of eighteen and nineteen of Greek and Latin life and literature, and thinks to mend it by greatly increasing their reading. It is quite true that boys' ignorance is very distressing and often very surprising; but it would be a grievous mistake to conceive of it as confined to classical subjects. In this country it is, and has for centuries been, a constant phenomenon, and if the remedy should mend it, something that has long seemed like an ingrained characteristic of young Englishmen will have been brought to a close.

NO. CCVIII. VOL. XXIV.

Now, the first criticism I would offer is a prosaic one. Mr. Snow seems to hope for a large amount of time to be saved by the abolition of Latin prose. But in most schools it would amount to less than an hour a week. He mentions in one place that 'in all sensible schools' verses are confined to the select few, and I gather that he would continue this exercise in their case. So this hour a week is all that we have to seize upon. It is miserably insufficient for the purposes Mr. Snow has in view. Fancy the optimism which would forecast a real increase of interest in Cleisthenes and Caius Gracchus and Polycleitus and Scopas and Agricola and a swarm of other worthies, all from one extra hour a week!

I gather, however, from one or two passages in the pamphlet that time is to be gained from teaching the minimum of grammar. But, apparently, less than the minimum is taught already. The Public Schools have been warned by the Joint Board that the standard of grammatical knowledge is seriously low. We are being exhorted to raise it. Perhaps Mr. Snow would reply that if the Joint Board were wiser they would say nothing about the decline of grammar, but merely note it as an indication of coming enlightenment. The question, however, whether it indicates enlightenment or obfuscation is pressing for an answer, and I do not find any

D

guidance towards an answer in the pamphlet.

The point is really very simple, but it demands practical experience. Quite half of the boys who learn Latin and Greek are perpetually making nonsense of their authors because they ignore rules of grammar. It is not in the nature of the schoolmaster to believe that this evil can be remedied by teaching less grammar than he does now. It is found that if he teaches more, the number of blunders remains provokingly the same as it now is; but that if he teaches less, the number increases with alarming rapidity. Is this symptom to be ignored?

Parenthetically, I may remark that at this point Dr. Rouse's plea for oral teaching ought to be noticed. I pass it by, reluctantly, because for many years to come masters will not be able to teach orally in Greek and Latin so well as to clear away the difficulties which confront Mr. Snow and other reformers of to-day.

And again, it is all very well to say, 'Teach no Latin prose'; but Mr. Snow can hardly expect teachers to abandon sentences in the early stages of Latin, and if it be supposed that this stage is over and done with in a few months' time, I answer that that may be the case with a few boys, but it is conspicuously not the case with the majority—supposing, that is, that the old ideal of training in accuracy still survives. Many boys never get beyond this stage, if their teachers are aiming at grounding them soundly in the rudiments of Latin. Of course, if no attempt at grounding them is to be made, they may leave off sentences as soon as the teacher is tired of teaching them. But then we are brought face to face with the question, Why should they ever begin? In short, why should these boys learn Latin at all?

This is just the question that Mr. Snow has passed by. He suggests that in English schools the German ideal be pursued, which I take to be the bringing the young minds into contact with the life of Greece and Rome. But he omits to notice that if this is the only object in view, we should achieve it more successfully with 70 per cent. of the schoolboys if

they read English books about Greece and Rome than classical authors, through whom they move uneasily for some eight or ten years.

And let it be noticed that if Mr. Snow's suggestion were adopted for all boys from the beginning of their working at Latin, they would move through these authors still more uneasily in the future than they do to-day. For if experience teaches anything at all, it teaches that a mediocre boy by wrestling with graduated sentences, and still more, I should say, with verses, acquires *some* power of making out the sense of a sentence in Caesar, Xenophon, and Cicero; and that if he does no sentences and no verses he acquires less power—so little, in short, that at eighteen he is completely at sea in Sophocles or Tacitus. I say a mediocre boy, not a clever boy nor a German, nor a Scotch boy, but a mediocre, well-nourished English boy.

Therefore, we are left in bewilderment as to how many boys Mr. Snow's suggestion applies. It is arguable, no doubt, that some boys who in the public schools continue classics until nineteen get little good from their weekly prose after they have ceased to improve. I should say about 30 per cent. would be the amount. It would comprise those who fail to become scholars, but yet master the ordinary syntax and use it correctly. They have sucked out the advantage of some logical thinking, and they have acquired a vocabulary, and they have ascertained fairly definitely that some constructions are right and some are wrong. But the time comes about sixteen years of age, when these boys—not the clever, but the mediocre, as I have to repeat—can go on using their small stock-in-trade of constructions without adding to them nor getting any nearer towards writing anything stylish, or in the least like Latin; and from that moment they cease to progress. Undoubtedly these individuals gain very little, if anything, from the weekly exercise during the years sixteen to eighteen or nineteen; but their number is small, and tends to dwindle, because so many of them at sixteen and a half drop 'composition' and take to history, or science, or modern lan-

guages. So that in regard to Mr. Snow's proposal, the position is as follows: Up to, roughly, fourteen, all boys must do sentences or elementary prose if they are to learn to read Latin. The laggards must go on indefinitely, till all attempt to teach them the language is abandoned. From fourteen to nineteen the clever boys must of course practise prose, unless they are to be barred from a real literary accomplishment. (Whether Mr. Snow contemplates this I am not sure.) There remain a few who would not be injured, boys who cannot write Latin, but are intelligent enough to read fairly well. But their number is small, and the time they would gain would be wholly useless for the purpose in view.

In short, the course of this controversy shows that while schoolmasters often display ignorance of University requirements, University authorities are quite as much in the dark as to the central questions connected with the schools. There is urgent need of consultation and probing into the workings of young minds under the influence of different subjects. Professor A. D. Godley, for instance, in to-day's *Times*, says that the object of learning Latin and Greek is to introduce boys to great literatures. Others have said that Livy and Thucydides give them an opportunity of studying the principles of history and politics. Both pleas, of course, are true with regard to boys who reach a certain standard, but ludicrously untrue about the remainder. Thucydides is not the key to ancient history to a boy who never will know at which end of any sentence to begin. It would be just as rational to say that a quick-set hedge is the entrance to a pasture. The Greek author to a dullard is a barrier of the most

formidable kind. If he had never heard the name, he might some day be induced to read the book in English. As it is, he shrinks for life not only from Thucydides in the original, but from Jowett's translation, and everything else to do with Greece.

Nearly all writers and speakers on this topic ignore the enormous difference between human brains. If it is considered, it will be felt to demand a different programme for the quick and the slow; and this leads to a suggestion which, though it concerns University matters, I will venture to make in conclusion.

All boys should be induced to learn Greek till sixteen and a half, who, it is thought, will profit more by reading the original authors than translations, wholly independently of any 'gymnastic' effect of puzzling out sentences. (This last object, I assume, is provided for by their work in Latin.) So restricted, the 'Grecians' would correspond fairly to honour men in all subjects, except a minority, who are found hopeless in classics, but quick in science or mathematics or history, or, possibly, modern languages. These should be exempted from the Greek along with the Pass men, but should offer a substantial amount of their own subject instead, which would be learnt during the later years of their school life.

This is a conservative proposal, and would leave 'Grecians' still numerous; but I doubt if it is safe to go farther in exemption till the exact effect of the *two* languages on second-class men has been more carefully studied, and some substitute, if required, has been devised.

E. LYTTETLTON.

TWO INSTANCES OF SYMBOLISM IN THE SIXTH *AENEID*.

IN two passages in the Sixth *Aeneid* it appears to me that there are traces of symbolism—in other words, that below the superficial meaning of these passages lies a deeper significance. The passages are 14-33 and 707-709.

I, lines 14-33. On the temple of

Apollo, dedicated by Daedalus at Cumae, are four scenes, or rather stories, wrought by Daedalus himself, and seen by Aeneas just before he consults the Sibyl. I have used the word story rather than scene, because I think the description by Virgil makes it clear that he is thinking not of

definite moments in the stories, but of their general outline; it would, for instance, be impossible to reproduce with any certainty what he describes. There are four of these episodes, two occurring in Athens, and two in Crete:—The death of Androgeos (1), and the choice by lot of the expiatory victims (2), make the two Athenian scenes. The corresponding Cretan scenes represent Pasiphae and the Minotaur (3), and the Labyrinth (4).

Virgil's phrase 'the death (*letum*) of Androgeos' leaves it quite uncertain which of the various legends concerning Androgeos he adopts. As to the penalty exacted by Minos, the story runs that seven youths and seven maidens were chosen by lot for sending as expiatory victims. Virgil's account speaks, as the commentators notice, only of the seven young men. A possible explanation of this is that he is thinking of Theseus' part in the story, how he volunteered to go when the time came for the casting of lots,¹ *stat ductis sortibus urna*. That Theseus is prominent in Virgil's thoughts throughout is obvious from his description of the fourth scene, which, whatever was actually represented, unmistakably recalls the escape of Theseus from the Labyrinth by means of Ariadne's gift, the thread furnished by Daedalus himself. Moreover, if further proof were wanted, we have it in the phraseology, which throughout is reminiscent of Catullus' description of the same story.²

The description of the four episodes is followed by the famous passage, explaining the absence of Icarus, the son of Daedalus:

Tu quoque magnam
Partem opere in tanto, sineret dolor, Icare,
haberes.
Bis conatus erat casu effingere in auro;
Bis patriae cecidere manus.

So far as I have been able to ascertain, Virgil originated the story that Daedalus founded the temple of Apollo at Cumae, and he certainly is responsible for the choice of the episodes represented at its entrance. Under these circumstances, it is probable

¹ Plutarch, *Theseus*, c. xvii.

² Catullus, 64, lines 76-115; see Conington, *passim*, and other commentators.

that the selection would have some bearing upon the situation of Aeneas. This expectation is increased by the allusion to the strong bond of affection between Daedalus and Icarus, *bis patriae cecidere manus*, reminding us that it is largely in the hope of visiting Anchises that Aeneas consults the Sibyl. Moreover, a parallelism between the story of the sculptures and the situation of Aeneas is suggested by the number of the victims which Aeneas is to sacrifice—seven bulls and seven sheep (lines 38 and 39), a number which recalls that of the Athenian youths (line 21). It may be said that seven is an obvious sacrificial number, but it is by no means universal in Virgil. The sacrifice at the funeral of Anchises consists of three pairs, that is of six victims (*Aen.* V. 96, 97). The sacrifice at Avernus consists of four bulls and two other victims (*Aen.* VI. 243-251). The sacrifice of Aristaeus to placate the offended Orpheus consists of two sets of four, that is of eight victims (*Georg.* IV. 550, 551).

So, then, it seems that the labyrinth—the entangled maze from which return is impossible, save with the clue given by its maker—must be intentionally suggestive of the underworld, where Aeneas was to wander under the guidance of the Sibyl and with the help of the Golden Bough, the sign that his enterprise had received divine sanction. That this analogy was in the poet's mind is, I think, made clear by his language. After Aeneas has asked permission to visit Anchises, the Sibyl replies (126-129) that entrance is easy enough—

Sed revocare gradum superasque evadere ad auras,
Hoc opus, hic labor est.

Hic labor repeats the phrase which introduces the description of the labyrinth (27),

Hic labor ille domus et inextricabilis error,

and so carries back the reader's thoughts to the fourth of the pictured scenes.

II, lines 707-709. The purified souls, seen by Aeneas gathering round the stream of Lethe before re-incarnation, are compared by Virgil to bees in summer visiting flowers and hovering round white lilies. The simile is not novel. Here, as on many other occasions, Virgil has followed Apol-

¹ For
lowed,
Rhodi
'Putti
there i
wantin
² For
blemat
immort
animal
of the
the Jon

lonius Rhodius, who (I. 879, ff.) compares the Lemnian women to bees coming from the rock, and hovering round fair lilies, gathering sweets in a dewy meadow. Apollonius himself has followed the Homeric simile (II. II. 87 ff.), which likens the assembling Greeks to bees collecting honey from flowers. The interesting point lies, not in the originality of the simile, but in its choice by Virgil for the place where it occurs.¹

The bee is a creature of special sanctity among the ancients, and has special associations with birth, death, and re-incarnation.² Thus, in Porphyry's *Cave of the Nymphs* (18), the bees of the Homeric passage (Homer, *Od.* XIII. 106) are allegorically interpreted as souls, and in particular as souls returning to re-birth in this world. I would not for a moment be understood as confusing the poetic symbolism of Virgil with the systematic allegorising of the Neo-Platonists. The souls assembled at Lethe's stream are not bees, but are like bees, just as the Golden Bough is like the mistletoe (*Aen.* VI. 205-209). The author of the Sixth *Aeneid* is no archaeologist or historian. But in this case, as in the other, it is probable that fuller knowledge of the associations that have gathered round bees and mistletoe will help to the understanding of Virgil's passage.

However, we need not go beyond Virgil himself for a statement of his associations with the bee. Re-incarnation could hardly be more clearly suggested than by the story in the Fourth *Georgic* of the miraculous birth of bee-life from the dead body of a bull, after due propitiation by Lethaeon poppies has been made to Orpheus. Earlier in the same poem (206-208) we are reminded that, though the individual bees perish, the

race remains immortal, *At genus immortale manet*. Most significant of all is the suggested explanation of the special virtue of the bee in the view of 'certain persons' (219-227), that the bees partake of ethereal draughts, *haustus aethereos*, this same ethereal element, *aetherium sensum atque aurai simplicis ignem*, being described in the great speech of Anchises as the only part left to the soul after its complete purgation (*Aen.* VI. 747). It is clear, therefore, that the bee in Virgil's mind was closely associated with the idea of the re-incarnation of the purified soul, and the comparison of the souls gathered round Lethe to hovering bees gains suggestiveness from this fact.

The question then arises whether there is any special point in the choice of the flower visited by the bees, *candida circum lilia*. The lily is not specially associated with bees in the numerous passages where bees' favourite flowers are described by Virgil. Low-growing plants, cassia, vervain, thyme, are the most commonly named. In eleven such passages from *Eclogues* and *Georgics*,³ there is no mention of lilies in association with bees. Lilies, *albaque circum lilia*, grow among the flowers in the garden of the Corycian old man (*Georg.* IV. 130), who also keeps bees and grows fruit. But it is of the beauty of the garden, rather than its utility, that Virgil is thinking in that passage. Lilies appear among an offering of flowers in the Second *Eclogue* (line 45); they are in the wreath round the head of Sylvanus in the Tenth *Eclogue* (line 25); with red and white lilies are compared the cheeks of Lavinia (*Aen.* XII. 68); lilies are to be strewn at the death of the young Marcellus⁴ (*Aen.* VI. 883).

It does not seem possible from these passages to infer anything definite as to Virgil's associations with white lilies. Nor have I been able to find any conclusive evidence elsewhere that the white lily is a symbol of immortality. Some indications that this is so are perhaps discoverable in post-classical traditions.

The Florentine painters have so familiar-

¹ For another instance where Virgil has followed, but not reproduced, a simile of Apollonius Rhodius, see Conington's note on *Aen.* VI. 309: 'Putting the similes side by side, we may see that there is a delicate propriety in Virgil's which is wanting to Apollonius.'

² For a complete account of the bee as 'emblematic of a fresh incarnation,' as 'a symbol of immortality, if not of re-incarnation,' as 'a sacred animal closely associated with the birth and death of the soul,' see the article by Mr. A. B. Cook in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, vol. xv., p. 1.

³ *Ecl.* I. 54; V. 77; X. 30. *Georg.* II. 213; IV. 30, 54, 109, 160, 181, 270, 304.

⁴ The above list exhausts the occasions where Virgil uses the word *lilia*.

ised us with the white lily as a symbol of purity that its other associations are apt to be overlooked. But a medieval writer¹ on symbolism says that the lily symbolises '*Sanctitas Castitas Aeternitas*,' and another curious passage quoted in the *Spicilegium Solesmense*² seems distinctly to associate the lily with the idea of resurrection, for one of six symbolical meanings given by the anonymous commentator to the lily is '*gloriam immortalitatis*.' Hence, he says, the following (*unde quidam ait*):

'Ecce sicut lilium germinavit
Quem ad diem tertium Pater suscitavit.'

But the most interesting suggestion comes from Dante. In the Earthly Para-

¹ Petrus Capuanus, commenting on the *Clavis* of Melito of Sardes.

² *Spicilegium Solesmense* Ed. Pitra II. 406; III. 475. 476.

dise, when the divine pageant approaches Dante,³ there were heard two sentences of greeting, uttered by the 'ministers and messengers of life eternal,' 'as though by the saints arisen at the last trump.' The first was: '*Benedictus qui venis*,' the words that greeted Christ on his entry into Jerusalem. The second phrase, sung as they strewed flowers above and around, was: '*Manibus o date lilia plenis*,' Virgil's tribute to the young Marcellus. The explanation of this second quotation is perhaps to be found not only in Dante's desire to associate with his entry into Paradise, where Virgil left him, the words of his 'sweetest father,' but also in an underlying thought of the lily as a symbol of eternity.

MARGARET DE G. VERRALL.

³ *Purg.* XXX. 13-21.

THE RELIGION OF HORACE.

I.

reges in ipsos imperium est Iouis
clari Giganteo triumpho
cuncta supercilio mouentis;
est ut uiro uir latius ordinet
arbusta sulcis, hic generosior
descendat in campum petitor
moribus hic meliorque fama
contendat, illi turba clientium
sit maior: aequa lege Necessitas
sortitur insignis et imos,
omne capax mouet urna nomen.

Odes III. I. 10-16.

By slightly altering the punctuation of this passage we restore to Horace an important declaration of religious belief. It is surprising that so many scholars should be content with the platitude which, with the accepted reading, follows upon the preface *faute linguis*, 'One man is richer than another.' Bentley did not like the commonplace: 'Sed excutiamus sententiam, EST UT, hoc est, fieri potest, ut viro vir, sive unus altero, sit ditior, nobilior, melior, gratiosior. Fieri potest autem? Quid hoc tam mirum? imo ita fieri necesse est: ita semper fuit semperque erit. Cave igitur credas tam frigidam gnomen ab Horatio profectam esse.' Bentley saw the malady,

and proceeds: 'Corrigo ESTO ut,' etc. I venture to suggest a simpler expedient. Remove the full stop after 'mouentis' and substitute a semicolon.

What, then, is this message that falls upon the religious silence? It is not the Epicurean teaching to which Horace held for a time. The message is a new one. It is to be chanted to girls and boys. It declares that human lot is determined by a divine providence.

Horace began to take life more seriously as time went on. The belief in a divine providence was confirmed for him when he escaped the falling tree. But long before that, in his infancy, he had wandered safely on the countryside 'non sine Dis.' The notion of a controlling destiny, therefore, coloured his whole life. His Epicureanism was never complete.

Hence we must not treat the odes which begin the third book as if they were the fulfilment of a task which was alien from his natural temper. Submission to the divine will is the key to life. Juppiter is the supreme being, and Augustus is lord upon earth because he bows to the will of him 'cuncta supercilio mouentis.' Sometimes

Horace substitutes for Juppiter the heavenly hierarchy, but without change of meaning: 'Dis te minorem quod geris, imperas: hinc omne principium, huc refer exitum.' This is a plain paraphrase of the line of Theocritus: ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα καὶ ἐς Δία λήγεται Μοῖραι. Following the opening line of Aratus' *Phaenomena*, Horace gives a Stoic turn to his verse. Bearing these references in mind, we shall see in the *Necessitas* of our quotation something more than a mere figure of speech. With her law of justice she is the Stoic providence brought to Rome. Horace is a Stoic preacher for the nonce. Since *Fortuna* herself is the eldest born of Juppiter, 'Iouis puer primigenia,' we are not surprised to find that *Necessitas* is her attendant (*Odes* I. 35. 17), where 'serva' has been wrongly altered sometimes by analogy with 'dira' in III. 24. 6. There seems to be an allusion to the worship of *Fortuna* at Praeneste in the mention of *Necessitas* along with the urn (III. 1. 16). Such is the way in which Horace blends together the national religion and the Stoic philosophy.

Nor is the typical wise man of Stoicism wanting. He appears as superior to the world in the beginning of the third ode, and as embodied in the *Regulus* of the fifth. Wickham draws attention (III. 2. 17) to the Stoic suggestion in the description of virtue, which, as Horace says elsewhere of Lollius, is, 'consul non unius anni.' These are high doctrines. They are as true and as difficult to put into practice now as then. The Stoic mode of life can only be pursued when it is sustained by the belief in a providence, and by the presence before the mind's eye of human embodiments, a *Regulus* or a *Cato*. The translation of Stoicism into conduct is not a commonplace. Hence we are assured by Horace that he is singing a new song. Human lot is assigned by a just law. The poor man has his compensations, and the rich man his drawbacks: 'Cur ualle permutem Sabina diuitias operosiores?' Make a friend of poverty. Let the youth to whom these odes are addressed learn 'angustam amice pauperiem pati.'

The translation of our passage, therefore, runs as follows: 'The rule of Jove is such

that one man has larger vineyards than another: one man is of nobler descent and higher character, but his fellow has larger estates. It is with an equitable law that Necessity (the will of God) marks out by lot high and low. Every name comes in its turn out of the ballot-box.'

The world is ruled, therefore, by one supreme God, who is just to every man. For the variety of human fortune is not inconsistent with this supreme justice.

II.

Inmunis, aram si tetigit, manus;
non sumptuosa blandior hostia
molliuit auersos Penatis
farre pio et saliente mica.

Odes III. 23. 17-20.

Here, again, an altered punctuation will give a better sense. The passage has been misunderstood through laying a wrong emphasis upon the words of the first line. The purport of the whole ode is that simple religious observances are efficacious: 'Caelo supinas si tuleris manus,' etc. Hence we must translate: 'If the hand has touched the altar it is freed from the burden of debt towards heaven.' For this sense of 'inmunis,' compare a phrase of Cicero's: 'Quid immunes? hi certe nihil debent' (*Verr.* 2. 5. 21, 53). And this great gift, the freedom from the weight of obligation, comes by contact with an object in which a divine presence is felt. It is strange that the commentators upon this passage should have failed to put themselves at the Roman standpoint. The divine presence flows forth upon the criminal and refugee at the altar, so that one who does violence to the suppliant, also does violence to the god. But this conception is evidence of a belief which embraces not only the suppliant, but all worshippers who come within the gracious influence. There are sufficient traces of the sacredness of the altar at Rome. But the meaning of this sacredness is better seen in the parallel usages of the Semites. On one occasion Jacob 'set up a pillar' (wrongly translated 'altar') 'and called it El the God of Israel' (*Gen.* xxxiii. 20). Hence the sacredness and the comfort of the altar consist in this, that it is the house of God and the gate of heaven: 'Inmunis, aram si tetigit, manus.'

III.

uenena magnum fas nefasque non ualent
conuertere humanam uicem.

Epodes, 5. 87-88.

The boy who is in the hands of the witches prays in the Stoic manner of the passages we have been considering: 'O deorum quicquid in caelo regit terras et humanum

genus!' There is a divine *imperium*. Hence we must translate: 'Poisons cannot change the mighty law of right and wrong to suit a human turn.' *Humanam uicem* is an accusative of manner, such as *meam uicem*.

FRANK GRANGER.

University College, Nottingham.

ON ARISTOTLE, NICOMACHEAN ETHICS, iv. 3. 15.

In describing the *μεγαλόψυχος* Aristotle says: καὶ δόξειεν ἂν εἶναι μεγαλοψύχου τὸ ἐν ἐκάστῃ ἀρετῇ μέγα. οὐδαμῶς τ' ἂν ἀρμόζοι μεγαλοψύχῳ φεύγειν παρασεΐσαντι οὐδ' ἀδικεῖν· τίνος γὰρ ἕνεκα πράξει αἰσχροῦ ᾧ οὐθὲν μέγα; the phrase φεύγειν παρασεΐσαντι is explained by commentators as meaning 'to run swinging the arms.' To support this rendering they quote (a) *De Motu Animalium*, 705 A 17: καὶ οἱ θεόντες θάττον θεόντι παρασεΐοντες τὰς χεῖρας. But this parallel differs in two important respects: (1) *θέω* is the word used to express 'running'; (2) the insertion of τὰς χεῖρας defines the application of παρασεΐειν. (b) They quote also *Prob.* 881b: διὰ τί κοπιαιώτερόν ἐστι τῷ βραχίονι τὸ διὰ κενῆς ρίπτειν ἢ λιθάζοντα; ἢ ὅτι σπασματοδέστερον τὸ διὰ κενῆς ἐστιν; οὐ γὰρ ἀπεριδεῖται πρὸς οὐδέν, . . . ὁμοίως δὲ τοῦτω καὶ ὁ πένταθλος πρὸς τοὺς ἀλτήρας καὶ ὁ θεὸν παρασεΐων (supply ἀπεριδεῖται: 'balances himself') πρὸς τὰς χεῖρας. διὸ ὁ μὲν μείζον ἄλλεται ἔχων ἢ μὴ ἔχων ἀλτήρας, ὁ δὲ θάττον θεὶ παρασεΐων ἢ μὴ παρασεΐων. Here again the meaning of παρασεΐων is limited by the use of χεῖρας, and by the context. (c) They quote also *Theoph. Char.* 4.: παρασεΐσαντα δὴ δει τοῖς τοιοῦτους τῶν ἀνθρώπων [φεύγειν added by Casaubon] καὶ διαράμενον ἀπαλλάττεσθαι, ὅστις ἀπύρετος βούλεται εἶναι. A good meaning can be given to this passage without Casaubon's addition of φεύγειν, and of τὰ σκέλη to διαράμενον—namely, παρασεΐσαντα: shaking them off, and διαράμενον: removing them from one's self (cf. *Plut. Ages.* 15: τὸν πόλεμον διάρᾳ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς θάλαττης).

Thus in these passages παρασεΐειν has the literal meaning 'to shake by the side

of,' but is closely limited in application by the context. This limitation does not exist in our passage. Further objections to the usual rendering are: (1) Why should παρασεΐσαντι be aorist participle and not present? (2) Is φεύγω elsewhere used as a synonym for θέω? (3) Is Aristotle joking when he couples so closely the performance of injustice and undignified running? We know that fast walking in the streets (ταχέως βαδίζειν) told against an Athenian in a law court (*Demosth. Contra Pantæon.* 52). But would a philosopher count such an action equal to ἀδικία? Could it be called αἰσχος?

παρασεΐειν, I would suggest, has the meaning 'to blackmail,' or 'to use extortion,' which σεΐειν has in *Aristoph. Fr.* 20, ἔσειον, ἤτοιον χρήματα, ἡπείλουν, ἐσυκοφάντουν; and in *Pax* 639 Cleon says: ἔσειον τοὺς παχεῖς καὶ πλουσίους. Cf. *Eq.* 840, *Antipho.* 146, 22; *Ev. Luc.* 3, 14, μηδένα διασεΐσητε μήδε συκοφαντήσητε. The metaphor, perhaps, is that of shaking a tree to cause the fruit to fall. The late Latin word for blackmail is 'conscussio'; 'διασεΐσμός occurs often in Egyptian papyri' (*Lid. and Scott*).

φεύγειν, then, would mean 'to be a defendant.' The aorist thus is seen to be the appropriate tense of the participle. The *μεγαλόψυχος*, says Aristotle, so conducts himself that (1) he is never accused on a disgraceful charge such as that of having been a blackmailer; (2) he never does injustice (οὐδ' ἀδικεῖν).

This interpretation derives strength from two features of Greek life. (1) The activity of συκοφάνται, to whose attacks a *μεγαλόψυχος* would be much exposed. Cf. *Jebb's*

note on Soph. *Phil.* 685: 'In describing a man of peaceful and estimable character the Greek tendency is to say: he neither did nor suffered wrong. Cf. Lys. *Or.* 12, § 4: οὐδένε ποποτε οὔτε ἡμεῖς οὔτε ἐκείνος δίκην οὔτε ἐδικασάμεθα οὔτε ἐφύγομεν, ἀλλ' οὕτως ὠκοῦμεν δημοκρατούμενοι ὥστε μήτε εἰς τοὺς ἄλλους ἐξαμαρτάνειν μήτε ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἀδικεῖσθαι.'

The second feature is the fact that three of the Hellenes who approached the excellence of the *μεγαλόψυχος* were accused of extorting money—namely, Miltiades, Themistocles, Pericles. Extortion seems not to have been so common in Greece as in Rome, but it did occur. There is no technical word for the offence; the words used by Plutarch to translate 'res repetundae' are *δίκη δόρων* (*Sulla* 5). For the

case of Miltiades, see Hdt. 6, 132 f. Miltiades tried to extort 100 talents from the Parians, and failed; on his return to Athens, τοῦ δήμου ζημιώσαντος κατὰ τὴν ἀδικίαν πενήκοντα τάλαντοισι, Miltiades died. For Themistocles, see Hdt. 8, 112. For Pericles see Plut. *Per.* 33, ψήφισμα κυροῦται . . . ὅπως οἱ λόγοι τῶν χρημάτων ὑπὸ Περικλέους εἰς τοὺς Πρυτάνεις ἀποθεβείν . . . Ἄγων δὲ κρίνεσθαι τὴν δίκην ἔγραψεν . . . εἴτε κλοπῆς καὶ δόρων εἴτ' ἀδικίου βούλοιτό τις ὀνομάζειν τὴν δίωξιν.

The analogy of *σεῖν* and *διασεῖν* and the foregoing facts seem to me to decide the meaning of *παρασείσαντι* *φεύγειν* in this passage of the *Ethics*.

JOHN MACINNES.

The University of Manchester.

NOTES

NOTE ON *GEORGIC* IV. 228-231.

Si quando sedem angustam servataque mella
Thesauris relines, prius haustu sparsus aquarum
Ora fove fumosque manu praetende sequaces.

PRACTICALLY all the modern editors read *angustam* and *ora fove*. Most commentators construct *ora* with *sparsus* = *habens ora sparsa*, which seems a somewhat forced and unnatural construction, for which I can find no exact parallel.

It seems to me that we ought to restore the Medicean *ore fave*, a variant recognised by Philargyrius and Servius, and which suits the context.

Vergil regarded the hive as a *templum*. The bees, its tiny tenants, are *pars divinae mentis*.

In the ten lines immediately preceding this passage, Vergil represents the bees as having, so to speak, their finite existence as an efflux from the one Infinite Intelligence. They do not die, *sed viva volare sideris in numerum, atque alto succedere caelo*.

What Vergil exactly means by this *sideris in numerum*, we cannot say. But this mystic climax was evidently intended by him to envelop the bee with a halo of sanctity. Immediately after he has described the

theosophy of the bee-life, Vergil proceeds to deal with the desecration of their '*sanctum sanctorum*' by sacrilegious man.

Therefore, retaining the reading *angustam*, not *angustam*, and *ore fave*, not *ora fove*, we have the following directions given to the man who ventures to plunder the divine nectar of the heavenly denizens of this august temple (*aerii mellis caelestia dona*).

1. Approach with reverence and be careful to observe the necessary purificatory rites: *prius haustu sparsus aquarum*.

2. Maintain an auspicious silence (*ore fave*) such as becomes the holy precincts.

In support of this reading and interpretation of the passage, we might notice the following points: *spargere* and *haurire* were technical terms in connection with the ceremonies of purification. Vergil seems to use them in this sense in at least three passages:

In *Aeneid* IV. 635,

'Dic corpus properet fluviali spargere lympa.'

In *Aeneid* VI. 635,

'Occupat Aeneas aditum, corpusque recenti spargit aqua.'

In *Aeneid* IX. 23,

'Et sic affatus ad undam
Processit, summoque hausit de gurgite lymphas,
Multa deos orans, oneravitque aethera votis.'

Vergil also uses *ore favete* (the regular formula at sacrifices, like *εὐφημεῖτε*) in *Aeneid* V. 71:

'Ore favete omnes, et cingite tempora ramis.'

Compare Homer (*Iliad* IX. 171): *φέρει δὲ χερσὶν ὕδωρ, εὐφημῆσαι τε κέλαισθε*.

There is a hazy mysticism that defies translation in Vergil's description of the bee as it passes from our ken into a non-material existence, wherein these tiny creatures help to swell the harmony of heaven in *numerus sideris*.

There is a touch of Pythagorean dignity about the word *numerus* here, and possibly in *Aeneid* VI. 545, *explebo numerum*.

It reminds one of Tennyson's fine climax on Death

'His shadow darkens earth: his truer name
Is "Onward," no discordance in the roll
And march of that Eternal Harmony
Where to the worlds beat time.'

The more we ponder on the dignity of Vergil's preceding climax, the more readily we can appreciate the suitability of *augustam sedem* and *ore fave* in such a context.

ROBERT F. CROOK.

Trinity College, Dublin.

A NOTE ON LIVY IX.

Livy IX. cap. 1, § 9.—Surely there is no need to supply *qui* in sense before *placari nequeant*. Place a semicolon or full stop at *sint*. The clause *quorum . . . exsatient* will then be the subject of *placari nequeant*. The supply of *qui* from *quorum* is awkward in any case, but particularly awkward here where its omission (1) seems at once to differentiate the *nequeant* clause from the two previous relative clauses, and (2) makes it possible to take the sentence in a totally different way (*viz.* the way here advocated).

The sense is now excellent. *Quorum = quod eorum*, and the clause states a known historical fact—the cruelty of which the Romans have already been guilty—as a reason for judging them capable of still more inhuman conduct. 'It is only one

step from what they have done,' says Livy, 'and from what we know them to be capable of, to the drinking of human blood and eating of human flesh.' The chiasmatic form of the sentence should be noted:

(mors-deditio) (exsatient) (placari nequeant) (nisi —praeberimus).

E. W. CORNWALL.

University of Melbourne,
Australia.

TWO NOTES ON CICERO.

1. Cicero, *De Senectute*, ch. xvi. § 56:

Jam hortum ipsi agricolae succidiam alteram appellat.

This farmers' saying, that the kitchen garden is a second 'fitch,' finds its explanation in [Virgil] Moretum U. 56 foll.:

Non illi suspensa focum carnaria juxta,
durati sale terga suis truncique, vacabant,
traiectus medium sparto sed caseus orbem
et vetus adstricti fascis pendebant anethi.
ergo aliam molitur opem sibi providus aeris.
hortus erat junctus casulae, quem vimina pauca
et calamo rediviva levi munibat harundo.
exiguus spatio, variis sed fertilis herbis.

Cf. *De Sen.* xvi. § 56: 'Villa tota locuples est: abundat . . . caseo.'

In allusion to this passage Professor Warde Fowler (*Social Life at Rome in the Age of Cicero*, p. 33) says that the small cultivator 'has no sides of smoked bacon hanging from his roof, so to add to his meal he goes into his garden and gathers thence various herbs and vegetables, which he then makes into the "hotch-potch" which gives its name to the poem.' Thus the small holder, who has no live-stock, must use his garden as a *first* 'fitch.' Professor Warde Fowler, however, does not seem to connect the passage with the phrase in the *De Senectute*.

2. Cicero, *Att.* I. 16 § 3:

Non enim unquam turpior in ludo talario consessus fuit. Maculosi senatores, nudi equites, tribuni non tam aerati quam, ut appellantur, aerarii.

Tyrrell emends 'non tam aerarii, ut appellantur, quam aerati,' 'not so much

pay-givers, as they are usually styled, as pay-takers.' He calls the vulgate reading pointless, adding, 'If I were forced to give some meaning to these words, I would rather take *aerarii* in the sense of 'bribed,' as *nummarii* in § 8, 'deserving only too well their ordinary name of *aerarii*, though in a very different sense.'

The emendation involves a violent change of order. Is it not possible to take the vulgate as Tyrrell suggests, but with a definite allusion to the *aerarium*? 'Not so much bribed, as animated treasuries, deserving their official title': i.e. they were so heavily bribed as to be walking money-boxes, literally stuffed with money.

M. E. HIRST.

NOTE ON KAI OY.

Strictly speaking, οὐδέ (in the sense of 'and not') adds a negative to a negative, whereas καὶ οὐ adds a negative to a positive. When a negative phrase repeats for the sake of emphasis what has just been expressed positively, it is introduced by καὶ οὐ, not by οὐδέ, nor yet by ἀλλὰ οὐ (which introduces, not a *repetition*, but a strong *contrast*). This appears to be by far the most common use of καὶ οὐ:

Homer, *Od.* II. 61, λευγαλίοι τ' ἐσόμεθα καὶ οὐ δεδαγκότες ἀλκὴν.

Aeschylus, *Pers.* 266, καὶ μὴν παρὼν γε κοῦ λόγους ἄλλων κλύων.

Sophocles, *O. T.* 58, γνωτὰ κοῦκ ἀγνωτὰ μοι.

Ib. 1230, ἐκόντα κοῦκ ἄκοντα.

Ib. 1275, πολλάκις τε κοῦχ ἄπαξ.

Trach. 160, ὥς τι δράσων εἴρπε κοῦ θανούμενος.

Ib. 235, θάλλοντα κοῦ νόσφ βασύν.

Ib. 747, δεδορκὼς κοῦ κατὰ γλῶσσαν κλύων.

Antiphon, *Tetral.* B. γ. 1, ἔργε καὶ οὐ λόγῳ.

Herodotus I. 173, καλέουσι ἀπὸ τῶν μητέρων ἑωντοῦς καὶ οὐκὶ ἀπὸ τῶν πατέρων.

Thucydides VI. 78, 1, ἔχων δὲ ζῆμματα ἐμὲ καὶ οὐκ ἐρήμος.

Ib. 92, 5, τῆς ἀπάσης Ἑλλάδος ἐκούσης καὶ οὐ βίῃ.

Plato, *Euthyphro* 11 C. τὰ ἐν τοῖς λόγοις ἔργα ἀποδιδράσκει καὶ οὐκ ἐθέλει μένειν.

Ib. *Apol.* 24 D, σιγῆς καὶ οὐκ ἔχεις εἰπεῖν.

The difference between καὶ οὐ and ἀλλὰ οὐ is well shown by Plato, *Apol.* 26 A:

σὺ δὲ ξυγγενέσθαι μὲν μοι καὶ διδάξαι ἔφυγες καὶ οὐκ ἠθέλησας, δεῦρο δὲ εἰσάγεις, οἱ νόμοι ἐστὶν εἰσάγειν τοὺς κολάσεως δεομένους, ἀλλ' οὐ μαθήσεως.

Here, clearly, καὶ οὐ repeats, ἀλλ' οὐ contrasts.

Of course there are other uses of καὶ οὐ, but the distinction between it and οὐδέ or ἀλλὰ οὐ seems never to be entirely lost. Thus we have καὶ οὐ in Euripides, *Phoen.* 272:

πέποιθά μέντοι μητρὶ κοῦ πέποιθ' ἄμα,

where either ἀλλὰ οὐ or οὐδέ would have made nonsense.

There are cases of οὐδέ where καὶ οὐ might have been used, but a distinction is usually to be observed. Thus:

Sophocles, *O. T.* 948, καὶ νῦν ὅδε πρὸς τῆς τύχης ὀλωλεν οὐδέ τοῦδ' ἔπο.

Ib. 1289, αὐδῶν ἀνόσι' οὐδέ ῥητά μοι.

Here οὐδέ adds something fresh; it does not merely repeat.

I can find but a few places where οὐδέ is exactly equivalent to καὶ οὐ.

Sophocles, *Electra* 929, κατ' οἶκον, ἡδὺς οὐδέ μητρὶ δυσχερὴς.

Euripides, *Electra* 98, φασὶ γάρ νιν ἐν γάμοις ζευθεῖσαν οἰκεῖν, οὐδέ παρθένον μένειν.

W. H. S. JONES.

St. Catharine's College, Cambridge.

REVIEWS

THACKERAY'S OLD TESTAMENT GRAMMAR.

A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek, according to the Septuagint. By H. St. J. THACKERAY, M.A. Vol. I., Introduction, Orthography and Accidence. Cambridge University Press, 1909. Pp. xx + 325.

THE appearance of the new Septuagint Grammar is an event of the first importance for the rapidly growing study of Hellenistic vernacular Greek. It has of course great value for theological students, but on this side I need say nothing here, reserving it for some comments in the *Journal of Theological Studies* (Jan. 1910). Mr. Thackeray's book is, as a matter of fact, of even greater significance for the philologist. For the first time we have the Septuagint systematically treated as an immense repository of *Koiné* Greek, in constant connexion with the other *Koiné* materials which the work of papyrologists and epigraphists has made available. I must pause a moment to qualify the *Priorität* which the phrase just used has suggested. Dr. Robert Helbing, of Karlsruhe, has managed to beat Mr. Thackeray by a few months in the race for this honour. His Grammar is a good piece of work, much better than would be supposed from the reading of Professor Wackernagel's one-sided review;¹ here the equally high authority of Professor Thumb² will serve to correct a condemnation based too much on details. But Thackeray's work, written in complete independence of it, is beyond comparison the fuller and more valuable of the two. It comes from a scholar already well known for remarkably acute and laborious work upon the different translators to be recognised among the books of the LXX, and in some cases within the limits of a single book. The results of this pioneer research are included in the Grammar before us, with a general sketch of the linguistic position of the LXX among the monuments of Hellenistic Greek, and a full

analysis of its words and forms as witnessed by the uncial MSS. To collect all this is a sufficiently noteworthy achievement for 'the very limited leisure of a civil servant' during eight years; and it becomes little less than marvellous when we add the exhaustive examination of the papyri and modern literature on Hellenistic grammar to which this volume bears witness. There are many other general comments that may be made on the book, but I must restrict myself here to a comment on the excellent style which the inheritor of a great literary name has been able to use even in a grammar, and the interesting touches that forbid the reader from skipping even such unpromising sections as that on the transliteration of proper names.

I proceed to a few points of detail. There is an interesting generalisation in the Preface (p. ix) upon the changes in Greek style which may be observed concurrently in the LXX books of successive periods and the contemporary papyri. The Pentateuch and Isaiah are good Common Greek, like the Petrie and the Hibeh papyri; the later prophets and the historical books reflect 'the more degenerate style of the papyri of the end of the second century B.C. (e.g. the Tebtunis collection).' A third period sees the rise of Atticism in the latest LXX books (so far as they escape the opposite tendency that produced pedantically literal versions), and in the literature of the school that finds its climax in Lucian. I pass by, in this review, most of the sections which deal with the relations of LXX Greek to its Hebrew original, only expressing my general satisfaction in Mr. Thackeray's treatment of the burning question of 'Hebraisms.' On one point I might add a word, the use of *προστιθέναι* (or the middle) c. inf. in the sense of the finite verb with *πάλιν*. That the frequency of this in the LXX (109 exx., see p. 53) is due to direct imitation of the Hebrew no one will question. But that it was hopelessly unidiomatic in Common Greek is not quite so certain. W. Schmidt years ago noted in Josephus

¹ *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, December, 1908 (No. 23).

² *Wochenschrift f. Kl. Philologie*, August 14th, 1908.

two examples of *προστίθεσθαι* c. inf. = *pergere* as the only Hebraisms to be detected in that blameless stylist—'id quod in eo ut in homine Judaeo imprimis laudandum est.'¹ To this Helbing (p. iv) has now added an example from pseudo-Callisthenes (ii. 41), οὐκέτι οὖν προσεθέμην ἀδύνατα ἐπιχειρεῖν. The fact that this 'Hebraism' stands alone in Josephus might be taken as decisive. We must, I think, hold that *προστίθεσθαι* (middle only) in this sense was idiomatic, though rare in the spoken Κοινή: the extensions found in the LXX are real Hebraisms, and the frequency of the use there stands with the other cases in which a correct locution is overdone because of its agreement with the translator's original. Mr. Thackeray's remarks (p. 56) on the accumulation of papyrus materials even since the appearance of my *Prolegomena* may be capped with the note that since his own book was written the Berlin editors have dropped a considerable collection of Alexandrian papyri from the reign of Augustus into the 'rather unfortunate gap' of i./B.C. and the first half of i./A.D., in which the papyri are 'sadly scanty.'² The remark still remains true, but the new material illustrates how rapidly our detailed work in Hellenistic grammar and lexicography comes in need of adaptation to fresh facts. The earliest dated papyrus is now no longer P. Hibeh 84 (as stated on p. 56), but P. Eleph. 1, from 311 B.C., published in 1907, but not in Mr. Thackeray's hands in time. On the next page (57 n.) it is said that the formula ἐρρῶσθαι σε εὐχομαι is 'extended in iv./A.D. by the addition of πολλοῖς χρόνοις.' But the Berlin papyrus 892 has this addition, and it is two centuries older than the period named (see the *Nachträge* for date). There may be other examples, but I have not looked farther. Immediately after this comes a fine piece of critical work on the history of the form οὐθείς *et sim.* Statistics are given from the papyri which answer well to those from Attic inscriptions in Meisterhans-Schwyzler,³ and

prove that οὐθείς was a fashion that arose early in iv./B.C. and finally vanished with the close of ii./A.D., being in almost exclusive use between 300 and 132 B.C. In N. T. times οὐθείς was virtually extinct. The exactness of dating that is possible here gives us an admirable test of the accuracy with which our MSS. reflect their autographs. In taking up my test-form τεσσεράκοντα, which is less favourable to the uncials than οὐθείς, Mr. Thackeray (p. 73) agrees independently with Helbing (p. 7) in assuming a phonetic basis, due to the influence of the *p.* On δυνεῖν (p. 92) the interesting explanation of Brugmann (*Gr. Gramm.*³ 55) should be noted: it seems more probable than that given here. A note of Wackernagel's may be brought in for the 2 aor. imper. pass. in -τι for -θι. Like Helbing, Mr. Thackeray does not mention ἐπιστράφητι (cf. p. 104), which Wackernagel says is regular in the first hand of B: he regards this Attic form as significant, showing that -θι was dissimilated in 2nd aor. after an aspirate, as well as in 1st aor. The other imperatives in -τι which are given here (not by Helbing) show how the analogy spread. On p. 124 Mr. Thackeray begins an instructive section on the curious irregular aspiration of which ἐφ' ἐλπίδι, καθ' ἔτος, ἀφιδεῖν, καθ' ἰδίαν, ἐφ' ἴσῃ, οὐχ ὀλίγος are typical examples. I am quite willing to be convinced that the long-lost digamma was an accessory here, if no better explanation turns up. But let it be noted that if any dialect was responsible, it is more likely to be Ionic than any other: note the formula ἐφ' ἴσῃ καὶ ὁμοίῃ, and the fact that Ionic had a habit of shifting aspirations within words. And of course Ionic had incomparably more influence on the Κοινή than any other dialect except (*longo intervallo*) Attic. Now, digamma disappeared in Ionic and Attic long before our oldest inscriptions begin; while in the dialects that kept *F* the substitution of *h* is far from normal in the words concerned. No device will get a digamma into οὐχ ὄψομαι (cf. Hesych. ἐφόπτῃς, and inscriptional ὕφοψίαν), or into ὀλίγος, for which Mr. Thackeray's ingenious suggestion seems hardly workable; and there are other cases of irregular aspiration in which no digamma

¹ *De Flavi Josephi elocutione* (1893), p. 517.

² *Griechische Urkunden aus den kön. Museen zu Berlin*. Band iv., Hefte 6-9 (1908-10).

³ Where οὐδέις is absent 'for over 250 years (300-60 B.C.).' There is a weak spot in the arithmetic here, I ween.

ever existed. To make this theory probable, we should have to find dialects in which aspirated forms can be shown to have been used in succession to a lost digamma, and then we must find a bridge from these dialects into the *Koinḗ*. Meanwhile we note the great value of Mr. Thackeray's additional evidence from the LXX uncials, which strikingly agrees with that accumulated hitherto from inscriptions and papyri and the relics still left in Modern Greek. Of equal value is the material collected (pp. 141 ff.) as to the flexion of words in *-ῶ* and *-ῶα*. The evidence given as to the time when *-ῶς* and *-ῶν* respectively became normal is very valuable for the marking of periods in the *Koinḗ*.

On the supposed metaplasmus in the flexion of *πύλη* (p. 58) both our LXX grammarians seem to have exposed themselves to Wackernagel's criticism (on Helbing, p. 49) that *τῇ πύλει, ταῖς πύλεσιν* in A must be recognised as mere itacisms because of the feminine article. The discussion of the recurring *πᾶν* in seemingly masculine use (pp. 174 f.) is acute and full. Helbing (p. 51) compares it with the indeclinable use of *ἡμῖν* and *πλήρης* (on which note Thackeray's acute discussion on pp. 176 f.); while Thackeray would make it a sort of neuter in apposition, starting from the 'idiomatic use of the neuter of persons' (*πᾶν ἀρσενικόν, πᾶν πρωτότοκον*, etc.). The latter might be compared with an idiomatic use characteristic of the Fourth Gospel, the faithful rendering of which has brought the Revisers a good deal of criticism. Thus in 17²⁴ *πατήρ, ὁ δέδωκάς μοι, θέλω ἵνα ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ κακέينو ὡσιν μετ' ἐμοῦ* and 17² *ἵνα πᾶν ὁ δέδωκας αὐτῷ δώσει αὐτοῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον* we have just this collective use of the neuter singular which is noted for the LXX. It is hard to choose between Helbing's explanation and Thackeray's, and perhaps both forces contributed. The very curious forms *εὐθής*, etc., for *εὐθής* (pp. 177 ff.) are ignored by Helbing. Wackernagel, in remarking this, suggests that they are started by the analogy of the very numerous adjective compounds of *εὐ* which end in *-ής*, with which *εὐθής* coincides in dat. singular and plural: *ἡμίσεως*, the regular gen. of *ἡμισυς*, may also have helped. We add with

Thackeray the nom. and acc. plur. *εὐθείς*, and note the parallel influence of the feminine *εὐθεία* in producing the new genitive plural *εὐθειῶν* and neuter *εὐθεία*. By the way, Mr. Thackeray might be supposed to have left out one form in his declension of this word: the regular gen. *εὐθειῶν* is cited in Hatch-Redpath for Ps. 110¹, and is mentioned by Wackernagel, who seems to have trusted that marvellously accurate concordance for once too far—*εὐθ(ε)ίων* alone appears in Swete's uncials. The sad consequences of being too trustful show themselves in a note on p. 188, where Mr. Thackeray has taken from me the statement that Codex Bezae never writes *δώδεκα*. I in my turn got it from Wellhausen—*clarum et venerabile nomen*! But I ought to have verified my references for all that: I have found *δώδεκα* since in the MS. at Matt. 11¹ and elsewhere.

There is an interesting point made on p. 197 as to the dropping of the syllabic augment, which is confined to words in which the *ε* would have been unaccented: M.Gr. *ἔγραψα, γράψαμε*, are given as a parallel. The remark is significant, not only as supplying one more example of the striking anticipations of M.Gr. in the early Hellenistic period, but because of its bearing on the change of the Greek accent from pitch to stress. A note of Wackernagel's (on Helbing, 78) must be brought in to correct the statement that *ἑώρακα* 'appears to be the older Attic form,' as against *έώρακα*, which 'is certain in old comedy, and may have been always the vernacular form' (p. 204). W. emphatically asserts that *έώρακα* is the only genuine Attic, the other form being a Hellenistic assimilation to the imperfect. There is a slip on p. 233, where *χαρήσομαι* is called a future middle, instead of (formally) a passive. The note on *ἀπεκρίθην* (p. 239) gives us the interesting fact that the old *ἀπεκρίνάμην* survives rarely in solemn or poetical language. It happens that my own notes from papyri of the imperial age made the middle form much the commoner. Mr. Thackeray's note prompted me to look up the passages again, with the noteworthy result that all the quotations turned out to be from legal documents: *ἀποκρίνασθαι* in the N. T. and in later papyri seems

always to suggest *formal* reply, either actually in court or under conditions comparable with these. It is not quite correct to call *νίπτω* 'the Ionic present from which the tenses are formed' (p. 277); *νίջω* and *νίջομαι* have alike the regular treatment of the velar in the root, and *νίπτω* is simply re-made by analogy. On *οἶμαι* (p. 279) it might be added that the forms without *ο* can be cited from papyri; and on *-φάσκειω*

(p. 288) that the N. T. has the future. There are a few other gleanings that I might add on points of detail, but these will suffice to illustrate the many-sided interest of an acute and most accurate book for all who think Greek worth studying in the period which we shall, I hope, soon cease calling the period of its decline.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

Didsbury College, Manchester.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN.

The Gospel According to St. John. The Greek Text, with Introduction and Notes, by the late BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D., D.C.L., Bishop of Durham, sometime Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge. London: John Murray, 1908. Demy 8vo. 2 Vols. Pp. cxcvi + 283; 394. 24s. net.

THE circumstances under which this work has been published necessarily make the reviewer's task less easy, and this the more, the livelier sense he has of what his own mental development owes to other work of the author. Bishop Westcott's Commentary on the English text of St. John's Gospel has been before the world for thirty years. Its publication was an interlude in his preparation for the present work, and he continued, so far as other duties permitted, to study, meditate, and write for his edition of the Greek text. Unfortunately, nine chapters have received no further treatment than is supplied by a few occasional notes; the remaining twelve chapters have been re-annotated. The introduction is verbatim the same, except for expansion of the section on Old Testament quotations. It would be unfair, therefore, and unnecessary to criticise those views which have been already so long before the world, and in respect of which this book may properly be considered to be merely a new edition of the previously published *Speaker's Commentary*. Thus the Bishop's well-known interpretation of *ἀντλήσατε νῦν* in ii. 8 receives no new support, and since scholars have long ago decided severally to accept or reject it, there is little use in pointing out

here that the reasons for that view are with one exception disposed of if we take the commentator's second alternative and suppose that the water became wine as it passed from the stone jars into the pitchers. In the stone jar it was water: it was found to be wine in the pitcher. The single exception is the question of the use proper to *ἀντλεῖν*, and for this it must suffice to refer to Dr. Abbott's *Johannine Vocabulary*, § 1710.

The extent to which the re-annotated chapters have been changed or amplified, if it may be gauged by an examination of the fourth chapter, proves to be very small. A few quotations from Origen and Rupert of Deutz almost complete the list of additions.

An illustration of the narrow limits, within which even the revised chapters must be regarded as accurately reflecting the author's final judgment, is supplied by the treatment of the familiar *οὐχ ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι ἐτι τετράμηνός ἐστιν καὶ ὁ θερισμὸς ἔρχεται*; (iv. 35). Here an additional note at the end of the chapter tells us that 'Bishop Westcott had placed inside the pages of his copy of St. John's Gospel a letter published in the *Tablet* (December 23, 1899).' The writer of this letter declares: 'My contention is . . . that . . . the disciples must have remarked that the crop before their eyes was *four months old*,' and the editor, who thinks that 'it may be concluded that "the Bishop" considered the "new translation" worthy of consideration,' remarks as to the *ἐτι* (which is fatal to this interpretation) that Griesbach omits it 'on very fair authority, including the MSS. D and L.' But the Bishop's own

view of such manuscript evidence can be deduced from other passages, from his introduction, and from the text associated with his name. The writer in the *Tablet* shows the meaning of *τετράμηνος*, and that words like *παῖς* or *ῥα* are understood with it, but *χρόνος* rarely. Since, however, the adjective is of two terminations, *ῥα* may be supplied. Thus the sense is 'a period four months long is still to follow.' With this agrees the Latin vulgate 'adhuc quattuor menses sunt.'

The old *Speaker's Commentary* was, of course, in one volume. This commentary on the Greek text extends to two volumes. The difference in part is due to the larger and more legible type now employed, in part to the fact that the Greek is very wisely printed face to face with an English version, which is in the main that of the Revisers, amongst whom, as is well known, Bishop Westcott exercised a preponderant influence, so that their work may fairly be considered to exhibit in general his interpretation of the original. It is late in the day to criticise the principle which led to this version being made to all intents a concordance to the Greek text for the use of those who had no Greek; but continuing a line of thought which I opened some time back in this review (xx. 172 ff.), I must express a doubt whether there is justification for the note (vi. 54) on *τρώγειν*, that it 'expresses not only the simple fact of eating, but the process as that which is dwelt upon with pleasure,' and whether it is not rather the fact that St. John's paradigm of the verb for the idea of eating is not *τρώγω*, (*φάγομαι*), *ἔφαγον*, *βέβρωκα*. At any rate it is noticeable that he never uses *ἔσθιω*, and that that form is lost to modern Greek.

It was not to be expected that Dr. Westcott, whose death in 1901 antedated the publication of most of the papyri now accessible to us, should have realised the amount of readjustment which would be now held to be necessary in his theories of textual criticism. We have already considered one passage in which his judgment still seems to be sound; in another passage where he follows the undivided testimony of our present manuscripts and versions,

but notes that the evidence of certain early Fathers is apparently against that testimony, he hardly perhaps appreciates the strength of the internal evidence in favour of the reading apparently known to these Fathers. The passage is *ἦν δὲ ἐγγὺς τὸ πάσχα, ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων* (vi. 4), where the omission of *τὸ πάσχα* would leave *ἡ ἑορτὴ* to refer to the Feast of Tabernacles. The whole chronological sequence of the Gospel then becomes clear:

January 6, A.D. 29. The Baptism of our Lord.

February 16. Return after the Forty Days' Fast.

February 22. Last day of the week, which is described (i. 28-ii. 11); First Sign at Cana.

February 23 to March 18. He abode at Capernaum οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας (ii. 12).

March 18. ἐγγὺς ἦν τὸ πάσχα (ii. 13).

March 25 to April 1. τὸ πάσχα (ii. 23).

April 2 onwards. The disciples baptize; John at Aenon (iii. 23, 24).

May (beginning). Departure to Galilee (iv. 1, 43).

May (middle). John's imprisonment; our Lord's first preaching (Mark i. 14; Luke iv. 17).

June 13. Pentecost (ἑορτὴ, v. 1, 3).

June (latter half) to September. Ministry in Galilee (vi. 1; cf. vii. 1).

September (beginning). ἐγγὺς ἡ ἑορτὴ (vi. 4 and vii. 2).

September 18 to September 25. Feast of Tabernacles (vii. 10).

September 25. The Great Day (vii. 37).

From September to end of November. ? In Galilee.

December 3 to December 10. Feast of the Dedication (x. 22).

December 11. Visit to Peraea (x. 40).

? February, A.D. 30. Raising of Lazarus (xi. 1).

March (beginning). Retirement to Ephraim (xi. 54, 55).

March 31. Return to Bethany (xii. 1).

April 2. Palm Sunday (xii. 12).

April 7. The Crucifixion.

April 9. Easter day.

I have given the dates for the Passovers and other feasts on the assumption that the

years are A.D. 29 and 30. More will be said below as to this. Meanwhile, a few comments may be added. The evidence of Cyril and Chrysostom support our identification of Pentecost. Bishop Westcott declares that '*Pentecost* would suit well with the character of the discourse.' His difficulty that it 'would scarcely leave sufficient time for the events implied in ch. iii. and iv.' is seen to have no solidity by our table of dates. There is no ancient authority of any kind for identifying it with Purim, which moderns have been driven to do, because of the reading in vi. 4. (The only alternative explanation in the Fathers is that of Irenaeus and Eusebius, who make it a Passover.) That John was then imprisoned or dead is clear from v. 35. The words in iv. 35, discussed above, are plainly a sort of proverb. They would gain point if at the time the fields were 'white unto harvest,' and this would be the case from the middle of April to the end of May (i., p. 166; cf. p. 205). The author has insufficient warrant for saying of 'the period named' that it 'is less than the interval between seed-time and harvest.' From Christmas to the end of April is no more than four months.

It will be noticed that this scheme gives a special significance to the fact that St. Luke (iv. 18, 19) continues his quotation from Isaiah lxi. 2 to the words *κηρύξαι ἐναντὶν κυρίου δεκτόν*. Modern commentators have discounted the testimony of the *Clementine Homilies*, of Clement of Alexandria, of Julius Africanus, Hippolytus, and Origen, to a one-year ministry by supposing that it was only an inference from these words of Isaiah, and due weight has not been given to the reason of St. Luke's quotation. A scrutiny of his quotations will show that he himself must have thought our Lord's ministry lasted but for a year, otherwise he would have ended the quotation earlier. It follows that the authority for this hypothesis is much older than that of the Fathers above mentioned, and it must now be insisted that this supplies the key to the difficult words in St. John's Gospel (xi. 49), *Καίάφας, ἀρχιερεὺς ὢν τοῦ ἐναντιοῦ ἐκείνου* (cf. xviii. 13, ὅς ἦν

ἀρχιερεὺς τοῦ ἐναντιοῦ ἐκείνου), of which Dr. Westcott has been able to give even here no substantially improved exegesis.

It is very remarkable, to say the least of it, that if we accept A.D. 30 as the year of the Crucifixion, then on the hypothesis here submitted all difficulties vanish in St. Luke's date (iii. 1) for the Preaching of John the Baptist. The autumn of A.D. 28 falls in Tiberius' fifteenth year. And no one has yet explained why, unless the Crucifixion was notoriously in the next year, this date should be so carefully fixed rather than that of the Crucifixion, which must have been known to Christians when St. Luke wrote.

But to return to a more general review of the work before us. It is unfortunate that, while Dr. Westcott's attention was caught by an article in the *Tablet*, he should have either missed or attached too little importance to some work of Dr. Abbott's published in this Review (viii. 89 ff.). There can be no reasonable doubt that Dr. Abbott is right in explaining (ii. 20) *τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἐξ ἔτεσιν οἰκοδομήθη ὁ ναὸς οὗτος* by the fact that the second Temple was finished forty-six years after Cyrus' accession to the Persian (not the Babylonian) throne in 559. In his *Johannine Grammar*, § 2023, Dr. Abbott well quotes Eusebius: *ἀπὸ δὲ δευτέρου ἔτους Δαρείου ἕως ἔκτου ἀνεπληρώθη (sc. ὁ ναός) . . . ἐν μὲν ἔτεσιν ὅλοις ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου ἔτους Κύρου*.

Dr. Westcott in the first instance purposely refrained from examining other modern English commentaries, and this scrupulousness of independence is intelligible. But it will be hard to find many references to any Johannine literature after 1880, and a work practically at least twenty years old cannot be expected to be as fully equipped as could be desired. It is true, however, to say that Bishop Westcott's Commentary must for many years to come be a landmark in the history of the interpretation of St. John, and that this edition of the Greek is necessarily an improvement on the *Speaker's Commentary*, of which it is a revision.

T. NICKLIN.

SHORT NOTICES

Tertulliani Opera, ex recensione AEMILII KROYMANN. Pars III. Vienna: Tempsky. 1906. Pp. xxxvi + 650. M. 20.

THE Vienna edition of Tertullian, interrupted by the death of August Reifferscheid, has been resumed by Wissowa and Kroymann. The latter, who has undertaken the third and fourth volumes, has been the prompter of the two, for the second is as yet unpublished. The third volume is not the easiest part of a very difficult task. Its contents are derived from one lost MS. of Cluny, of which the three known copies were made for religious houses at no great distance. One of them is now at Montpellier, whither it came from Troyes; another, written for Payerne, near Neuchâtel, is at Schlettstadt; while the third, written for Gorze, near Metz, is only known through transcripts. The history of the MSS. is very clearly and attractively traced in the preface, which shows the recklessness of Renaissance monks in parting with their treasures. Beatus Rhenanus got two MSS. for the asking from German libraries. Even the archetype, earlier than the eleventh century, when the existing MSS. were copied from it, was very defective, and Tertullian has had to owe a great deal to his editors. A very full account of these, with due praise of Beatus and Rigault, is given. In regard to Pamèle, Kroymann is as severe as Hartel, whose description of his work on Cyprian is trenchant: 'optimam Morelii editionem sequitur pessima Pameliana.' But Kroymann is hardly fair to poor Oehler, the companion by this time of a third generation of students. He recognises Oehler's industry in annotation, and is not unjust to his uncritical use of the MSS. But Tertullian is an author for whom emendation is peculiarly needful, and especially in the treatises contained in the present volume, and Oehler was not sparing of his conjectures. Many, no doubt, were bad enough, but when we remember that one chief result of Reifferscheid's volume was an increase of confidence in Oehler's work, whose readings

were largely accepted by the later editor, it seems an excess of blame to read 'emendator vero Oehlerus utrum risum saepius an bilem mihi moveat incertus haesito.' However, we must thank Kroymann himself for a much better text than has yet appeared, though there remains an abundance of opportunity for fresh emendations as good as his best. We may cite as an instance of sound and satisfactory, though not very difficult, change 'aeone' for 'de bono' in *Adv. Herm.* 10 (p. 137. 4). The editor is not always equally successful, and he is too apt to make play with lacunae and brackets, and also with transpositions on a considerable scale; yet these latter are often judiciously made. Perhaps a little more recognition of the fact that the grammar of Tertullian differs from that of the classical age might have induced him sometimes to withhold his hand from emendation; 'unde,' for instance, is more than once corrected into 'undeunde.' Why should not 'unde' in the third century have had the sense of the other? As a last criticism, we must regret that while Oehler's sections, often irrational enough, are retained in form, they are made frequently to begin a little earlier or later in the text, to the great confusion of the reader. It would have been easy to break up the text into new paragraphs according to the sense, while keeping the old numerals in the margin. In spite of these slight defects, the edition is a scholarly piece of work, for which we are grateful.

E. W. WATSON.

Christ Church, Oxford.

Boethii in Isagogen Porphyrii Commenta. Recensuit SAMUEL BRANDT. Vienna: Tempsky. 1906. 8vo. Pp. lxxxvi + 423. M. 16.

As the editor says at the end of his elaborate *Prolegomena*, the logical works of Boethius will find few readers among theologians or philosophers, though occasionally they will attract the attention of

a historian of philosophy. In fact, the present treatises have not been edited since 1546, when Glareanus published his reversion of the works of Boethius, though they have several times been reprinted. The latest reprint is the third edition of Migne in 1891, and according to Brandt, 'mendis typographicis scatet.'

The history of Boethius' double commentary is curious. As a very young man he made what seems to have been his first essay in logic, by commenting on the translation of the *Isagoge* made by Marius Victorinus. He cast his work in the conventional form of a dialogue, beginning prettily with a winter scene and an invitation from a friend named Fabius to explain the mysterious art of reasoning. He takes as his textbook that of Porphyry, an introduction to Aristotle's *Categories*. The dialogue gradually becomes more and more perfunctory till it revives at the end, the treatise closing with a little literary flourish and a colourless quotation from Petronius. The version of Victorinus is not reproduced, but only cited at intervals, though it supplies the chain of the argument. It was a poor piece of work; in one case, as Boethius points out, ἀνάλογον is rendered as if it were ἄλογον. Yet it had its points of interest, as when Cicero and Virgil are given as the Latin equivalents of Socrates and Plato. This is an early example of Virgil's fame as a sage. When Boethius himself translated the *Isagoge* he employed Cato and Cicero in the same passage. Boethius indulges in a good deal of ornament in this youthful work, and is sometimes quite felicitous, as when he renders ὄργανον by 'ferramentum.' But he soon grew dissatisfied with the dialogue and with the version, and about 508, according to Brandt, he translated the *Isagoge* for himself, and commented upon it in a purely business-like way, paragraph by paragraph. The new translation was a real contribution to thought. In it 'subiectum' occurs; Victorinus had not thought of it. And apparently 'constitutivus' and 'specificus,' neither of which is to be found in Georges, first entered here into literature. Brandt has happily anticipated the completion of the edition by furnishing a very full verbal

and grammatical index to his own volume, which cannot be studied without profit.

Brandt has had a tangled task in the formation of his text. MSS. of one or both treatises, with or without Boethius' own version of the *Isagoge* extracted from the second, are numerous, though not earlier than the tenth or eleventh century; it is natural that France should have the largest number. Dealing with the same subject on the same lines, the two commentaries have suffered from contamination; and for the text of the version emendation is precarious, since Boethius had before him a defective MS. of Porphyry. The use of both treatises as textbooks has also tempted scribes to insert improvements of their own; and unfortunately the scholastic writers are later than our earliest MSS., and Brandt has not gained any light upon the true text by consulting them. But he has evidently been both conscientious and skilful in the execution of a somewhat ungrateful task, and we may safely put our trust in what will be for centuries the *textus receptus* of this portion of Boethius' writings.

E. W. WATSON.

Christ Church, Oxford.

SENATUS ROMANUS.

Senatus Romanus, qui fuerit Augusti Temporibus. By FISCHER. Diss. Berlin: Mayer u. Müller. 1908. 8vo. Pp. 125.

THE *lectiones senatus* under Augustus are a thorny problem, now attracting some considerable attention. The chief difficulty lies in deciding the date of the various *lectiones* and the nature of the powers placed in the Emperor's hands on each occasion. There is, however, another question on which more light would be desirable. What was the actual effect on the Senate itself of these revisions? In his dissertation Fischer seems to bring some material for the solution of this problem. His connection with Ed. Meyer, whom he names in his *Vita* as one of his professors, accounts for his interest in the subject. He has undertaken the task of collecting all the extant names of senators in the years 31, 27, 7 B.C., and

A.D. 14. As is natural, his work shows a diligent use of the *Prosopographia*, without which, indeed, his thesis could hardly have been prepared. For the year 31 B.C. he collects 220 names; for 27 B.C., 127 (of which 63 are known from the previous list); for 7 B.C., 148 (of which 29 are previously known); for A.D. 14, 276 (of which 47 are previously known).

These numbers testify to the industry of the author, but at the same time it seems to be a misconception to base on them statistics as to the proportion of members in the Senate for and against the Republican, Antonian, or Octavian parties. When only one-tenth of the total number of senators' names is preserved to us and those not according to any reasonable or qualitative selection, but entirely as the accidents of chance preservation ordain, it is hardly permissible to base on them any theories as to the proportion of parties. We must therefore reluctantly admit that this pamphlet does not materially throw light on the composition of the Senate at different times.

The appendix of short remarks on questions connected with Fischer's senatorial list contains among other subjects an attempt to determine the names of those families, who were raised from plebeian to patrician rank by Augustus in 29 B.C. by the *Lex Saenia*. The attempt is interesting, and seems to be the first of its kind. We must, however, quarrel with the author for the props with which he supports his conclusions. He quotes as evidence for the new patriciate of the Antonii, (up to this time admittedly plebeian), the fact that Augustus showed marked favour to Iullus¹ Antonius, with references to Plut. *Ant.* 87, Dio C. L.I. 15. 7, (and others on p. 53). If Antonius stood high in Augustus' favour, it is quite possible to suppose that he was of those on whom the patriciate was conferred; but is this more than a supposition? There is, in fact, scarcely any information as to the names of the new patricians, and the author is therefore driven in many cases to mere guesswork.

Many of the other families suggested by

him rest on no surer foundation than the Antonii. On p. 110 he might have given Statius, *Silvae* I. 2. 71, '*iuvenis patricius maioribus ortus*' (quoted in Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencl.*² s.v. *Arruntius*), though, of course, in this case the patriciate may be due to a later Emperor. A further reservation must be made, for it is by no means certain that in the poets *patricius* is not merely a convenient equivalent *metri gratia* for *nobilis*;³ in that case even the instance of the Sili would be reduced to uncertainty, resting as it does on Juv. *Sat.* x. 332. The author quotes the Aelii Tuberones as new patricians; the Aelii Lamiae are also generally held to have been raised to the patriciate,² though here again it is only a question of probability—cf. Tac. *Ann.* vi. 27. 2-5, Juv. *Sat.* iv. 154, vi. 385, and Hor. *Carm.* iii. 17, a poem written very shortly after the *Lex Saenia* was passed, in which Horace refers to the new (?) claims to a long pedigree made by the Lamiae.

The full index to this dissertation is a great convenience.

L. E. MATTHAEI.

Newnham College.

ROM UND ROMANISMUS.

Rom und Romanismus im griechisch-römischen Orient, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Sprache, bis auf die Zeit Hadrians. By Dr. LUDWIG HAHN. Leipzig: Dietrich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. 1906. 8vo. Pp. xvi + 268. M. 8.

THE spread of Roman culture in the East has been so inadequately treated that a real welcome may be offered to this work by Dr. Ludwig Hahn. In spite of their territorial conquests in the East, the Romans made but slow progress during the Republic in introducing their own speech, customs, or ideals into the conquered countries, and even during the Empire the advance of Roman culture was interrupted, incomplete, and by no means obvious. Dr. Hahn has brought together a very considerable amount of information,

¹ Misprinted on p. 110 as *Tullus*.

² Cf. Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencl.*² s.v. *Aelius*.

³ Cf. Duff ad Juv. *Sat.* I. 24, X. 332.

on which he has tried to found a sketch of the advance of the Roman spirit and of things Roman in the East until the time of Hadrian.¹ He divides his matter into five periods—early, middle and later Republic, the time of Augustus, and the early Empire. This arrangement is, in principle, unimpeachable, but has not proved altogether happy in practice; the reader seems always to be chasing his pet subject from one section to another. Possibly marginal headings might have helped him in his search.

Dr. Hahn concentrates his energies especially on the department of language with very successful results. His first-hand researches as to the various infiltrations of Roman words and constructions into Greek writings and inscriptions are a very solid foundation of information. We cannot equally praise the rest of the book. In spite of the interest of the subject, it is extraordinarily monotonous to read. Perhaps the author has been too diffident; instead of boldly advancing two or three ideas of his own and working them out thoroughly, he is inclined to quote the opinions of other people, and as he only quotes them in fragments the result is very disturbing. What ought to have been a general sketch of an interesting character has degenerated too much into a compilation. If Dr. Hahn intends to write more on this subject—and it is to be hoped that he will—it would be better if he presented his researches *either* in the form of a detailed and minute investigation into one particular point, as he has done in his section on language, *or* in the form of a very readable general sketch, without too much detail.

As for the actual information which Dr. Hahn offers, it seems quite accurate and fairly complete for a work which largely opens up a new field. It certainly bears evidence of a vast range of reading both in ancient and modern literature. In certain minor points of what may be

called the technique of historical research, Dr. Hahn is not sufficiently strict. *Gaius* should not appear either as *Caius* on p. 183 or as *Caligula* on p. 197. In Livy XLV. 23 (p. 27, n. 7), how can Dr. Hahn be sure that these references to Roman history really came out of the mouth of Astumedes, the Rhodian, and did not emanate from the brain of Livy, the Roman, in whose work they are found? Finally, on the first few pages, early Roman legends from Livy I.-III. and Dionysius of Halicarnassus should not be presented as though they were history.

LOUISE E. MATTHAEI.

Newnham College.

DIE GRUNDBEDEUTUNG DES KONJUNKTIV UND OPTATIV

Die Grundbedeutung des Konjunktiv und Optativ, und ihre Entwicklung im Griechischen. Von CARL MUTZBAUER. Leipzig: Teubner. 1908. Pp. x + 262. Paper, Marks 8; linen, Marks 9.

THIS treatise is an exhaustive investigation of the use of the subjunctive and optative moods in Homer, a few examples from Herodotus and Attic writers being added by way of illustration.

It is an important contribution to historical syntax, and from its thoroughness must be a valuable work of reference. As an indication of the labour involved in its composition, we may mention that reference is made to no less than ninety passages of a single book—IX. of the *Iliad*—while only one book of the *Odyssey* is quoted less than thirty times.

The explanations of the history of the moods most familiar to us in England are those contained in Goodwin (*Moods and Tenses*, Appendix I., p. 385), who believes it 'probable that at some early period the Greek had two parallel uses of the subjunctive and optative in independent sentences, as follows: ἐλθω, "I shall go, or, let me go"; ἐλθοιμι, "I may or might go, or, may I go";' and Monro, who leaves it doubtful whether the use of the subjunctive as an *Emphatic future* was derived from its use to express *will*, or *vice versa*, and seems to regard the

¹ The sketch is brought down to the time of Justinian in a subsequent paper, *Zum Sprachenhampf im römischen Reich*, *Philologus*, Supplementband x., p. 677-716 or separately, price M. 1.60.

ideas of *wish*, *concession*, *supposition* as very early established in Greek, 'being common to Greek and Sanscrit' (*Homeric Grammar*, § 317 and § 321, 4).

Dr. Mutzbauer dissents from both of these views. He considers that the subjunctive originally expressed *expectation*, the optative simply *wish*.

The expectation (*Erwartung*) may take the form of conviction or apprehension: thus καὶ ποτέ τις εἴησι means either 'I expect' or 'I apprehend' that somebody will say.

In negative sentences, οὐδέ τί οἱ βουλὰς συμφράσσομαι, I 374, means 'it is not to be expected that I shall advise'; while μή πως τάχ' ἐπ' αὐτοῦ δουρὶ δαμήης, Γ 436, is explained 'far from me be the expectation that, etc. (*fern sei die Erwartung*).'

Of ἄν and κέν Dr. Mutzbauer takes the conventional view that they have a limitative force.

The hortative subjective disappears: ἡμεῖς δὲ φράσωμεθ', ὅπως ἔσται τάδε ἔργα Δ 13, becomes 'as for us, you must expect that we shall . . .'

The dubitative subjunctive is likewise explained away: πῶς τ' ἄρ' ἴω μετὰ μῶλον; Σ 188, is 'how is it to be expected that I should go?'

Final clauses do not really express purpose; for instance, ὥς means 'from which point' (local or temporal), *i.e.* 'in which way, in this way': so

ἀγαθὸν καὶ νυκτὶ πιθέσθαι
ὥς σὺ τ' ἐνφρονῆς πάντας παρὰ νηυσὶν
Ἀχαιοῖς . . . H 294-95

is really 'it is well to obey night's bidding; thus (from which standpoint) we may expect that you will gladden the Achaeans . . .'

In 'conditional' clauses, so called, εἰ, αἰ, is not originally a conditional particle, but has a kind of hortatory sense, 'put the case,' 'suppose.' Thus, εἴ περ τε πύλας καὶ τείχε' Ἀχαιῶν ἠγξόμεθα, M 223, is, historically considered, 'I put the case, we must expect that . . .'

In the optative, the fundamental idea is *wish*; a wider development of the wish results from the question whether the individual considers his wish as more or less capable of fulfilment. If the idea that it

is capable of fulfilment is uppermost in his mind, the wish can be transformed into a clause expressing possibility: 'may this happen' becomes 'this may happen'; but a large number of cases of apparent subordination can be explained by parataxis. Thus ι 316 is simply a wish: αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ λιπόμην κακὰ βυσσοδομείων, εἴ πως τισαίμην . . . 'I stayed behind, brooding "Would that I might take vengeance."'

The sense 'it may' is, however, necessary in such general sentences as γ 231: βεῖα θεός γ' ἐθέλων καὶ τηλόθεν ἄνδρα σάωσαι. 'It is quite possible that a god may save. . .'; but after interrogatives the idea of wish is still implicitly present, *e.g.* Λ 838 πῶς τ' ἄρ' εἰοι τάδε ἔργα—'how can I hope that this may be?'

With Final clauses we get into rather deep water, as the wish becomes more remote: E 23. ἀλλ' Ἥφαιστος ἔρντο, σάωσε δὲ νυκτὶ καλύψας, ὥς δὴ οἱ μὴ πάγχυ γέρον ἀκαχήμενος εἶη—'Hephaestus saved him with the wish, "Perish the thought that the old man should be utterly bereft."'

The whole question of the import of the moods is an extraordinarily difficult and complicated one, and probably the last word on the subject has not yet been said; but the theories so fully elaborated in the present volume must at any rate be taken into account by future students of the subject.

J. F. DOBSON.

The University, Manchester.

SARDINIA.

A. Taramelli and F. Nissardi, L'altipiano della Giara di Gesturi in Sardegna, ed i suoi monumenti preistorici. (Monumenti Antichi pubblicati per cura della R. Accademia dei Lincei.) Milan: Hoepli. 1907. Vol. XVIII., Part 1, cols. 1-120 (pp. 60). 1 plate and 36 illustrations in text. 10 fr.

THE memoir before us details the results of the exploration by Professor Taramelli and Signor Nissardi of a region of peculiar interest—the so-called Giara di Gesturi, a

tableland in the south of the central portion of Sardinia, clearly marked off from the surrounding country by streams and by low ground. The tableland proper (formed by the superimposition of a deposit of basaltic lava on a group of hills of the tertiary period) occupies a roughly triangular area, with a perimeter of some twenty-three miles, delimited on every side by cliffs, which only allow access to the tableland at certain points; while the slopes below these cliffs, belonging to the same mountain group, and therefore forming an integral part of the region, make its total perimeter about three times as great. These slopes are thickly studded with nuraghi: and in my opinion the authors are undoubtedly right in reaffirming the conclusion already reached by Signor Nissardi, that they were fortified habitations; and to this point such characteristics as the existence of airholes, the various devices to render it difficult to approach or enter the nuraghe, the existence of groups of small circular buildings round them, etc. Far more important, however, are the considerations which rest upon the careful examination carried on by the authors, and fully explained in the paper before us, of the topographical distribution of these nuraghi.

In the centre of the tableland there are none at all, and it was probably used as a pasture in time of peace (as it is at present), and as a place of refuge in time of war. But its approaches are guarded by no less than twenty-three nuraghi, all situated at the edge of the cliffs. These are in sight of one another and of the far more numerous nuraghi on the slopes below, so that signalling, whether by day or by night, from one to the other was easily possible; and this careful strategic disposition, the existence of which cannot be denied by a careful observer, while interesting and perfectly explicable if we take the view already indicated of the purpose of the nuraghi, has no possible meaning if we accept the view, untenable on other grounds also, that they were tombs, as Pinza maintains (*Monumenti*, cit. Vol. XI., Part I, 1901).

The work of exploration has been most carefully and thoroughly done, but it is a pity that in one or two instances the nomen-

clature of the text and maps does not entirely correspond.¹

The general remarks which Professor Taramelli makes at the end of the article are also of importance. He is of opinion that it is as yet impossible to classify the nuraghi of Sardinia typologically in respect of their date (though those of simple plan, near the shore, may be perhaps regarded as the earliest), and that the first stages of their development have not been preserved to us.

Despite the undoubted analogies which they present with prehistoric monuments elsewhere in the Mediterranean basin (and, one may add, in Great Britain and Ireland), the writer well points out that too much has at times been made of the points of resemblance—notably by those who have desired to see in them buildings of a sepulchral nature, as the 'sesi' of Pantelleria undoubtedly are.

It is, on the other hand, most interesting to notice the great importance of Sardinia during the period of the nuraghi, when she appears to have occupied a position which she never since attained; and the further comparative study of the interrelations between the various parts of the Western Mediterranean in prehistoric times, which the British School at Rome hopes to undertake, may well lead to new conclusions as to the sources of the culture of this period.

A particularly interesting point may be noticed in conclusion. In col. 84 is described a rock-cut tomb, or *domus de janas*, as it is locally called, of the ordinary type, but having in front of it two steps forming a semicircle, produced partly by cutting away the rock, and partly by actual construction in masses of limestone. This presents, as the authors note, a singular analogy with the front of the other class of tombs, known as 'tombs of the giants,'

¹ In col. 47 there seems to be a positive mistake, inasmuch as it is there stated that there is no nuraghe at S. Vittoria, while the map indicates one. Nor does the sketch plan in col. 66 agree with the general map, which does not show the nuraghe Pranu Mendola. In col. 20 the niche for the sentinel is noted as being on the right, contrary to the usual custom, whereas the plan shows it in the usual place on the left.

which belong to the same period as the nuraghi, and are frequently found in relation to them, so that, as Dr. Mackenzie has pointed out (*Ausonia*, III., 18 sqq.), they must be considered as the family tombs of the inhabitants of the latter. This is a further argument for the contemporaneity of the two kinds of sepulchral monuments. The *domus de janas* are, however, so much less capacious, that it can hardly be supposed that the two types were merely adopted in different districts according to the material available—as Professor Pigorini explains the presence of a group of dolmens in Apulia (the only one in Italy), by supposing a dolmen, in country where there are no caves or rocky ledges suitable for their artificial formation, to be the equivalent of a rock-cut tomb in country where suitable conditions are present (*Bull. Pal.* 1899, p. 178, n. 4).

THOMAS ASHBY.

British School, Rome.

MUTZBAUER'S GRUNDLAGEN, VOL. II.

Die Grundlagen der Griechischen Tempuslehre und der Homerische Tempusgebrauch. Von CARL MUTZBAUER. Zweiter Band. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner. 1909. Large 8vo. Vol. II. Pp. xiv + 324. Price M. 9.

IN this volume Mutzbauer applies to verbs of the 't, nasal, inchoative, and i classes' and to the 'derivative' verbs his views, already familiar from Vol. I., as to the distinctions observable between the present, perfect, aorist, and future stem tenses in Homer. There follow several pages on *φημί*, omitted in Vol. I., and then 'the remaining verbs in alphabetical order.' An index is provided to the whole volume, but this only partly compensates for the confusing arrangement of the verbs in their different classes—e.g. *θωρήσσω*, *φυλάσσω*, etc., are not classed with either the -ιο- or the denominative verbs, but relegated to the miscellaneous collection of the 'remaining verbs.'

A suggested derivation from Curtius,

Fick, or Brugmann is supplied for the majority of the verbs, but the main purpose of the book, as is indicated in the preface, is syntactical rather than philological. It forms a collection of closely-packed examples, extending over three hundred and eleven pages, put together in a somewhat unilluminating manner. Under each verb the author postulates a meaning for the present and aorist stems, if both occur; but the grouping of the examples under these meanings seems often purely arbitrary, and no attempt is made to show why the imperfect and aorist are appropriate in their respective contexts. Thus φ 224 and 225 are quoted under *κυνέω* to illustrate the proposed meanings 'clung to with the lips' and 'gave a kiss to'; the latter should, according to Mutzbauer's general theory, stress either the initial or the final point in the action, presumably here the former, but he makes no attempt to explain why the poet thus accentuated the perfunctory nature of Odysseus' kiss in return for the lingering, affectionate salutation which he had himself received.

At times he is not only unconvincing, but self-contradictory—e.g. *ικάνω* is said to mean 'I am coming, am on the way,' the present stem depicting the progress of the action 'usually with the express meaning of completion, have arrived.'

The main distinction which marks off the imperfect from the aorist, viz. that it denotes an action as in progress, is well brought out (cf. e.g. the Homeric *ἐπέτελλε* which 'accentuates the details,' or the Thucydidean *παρεσκευάζοντο* which, as the pictorial tense, is preferred in almost all cases to *παρεσκευάσαντο*). It is unfortunate, however, that examples which admit of being explained as iterative or distributive are not always kept distinct from those which illustrate the purely continuous meaning of the present stem: hence Mutzbauer fails to draw attention to the existence of verbs which in themselves express momentary action (e.g. 'hit,' 'hurl'), and in which, therefore, the imperfect only differs from the aorist as having some kind of iterative meaning.

The treatment of the aorist, to which Mutzbauer appears to ascribe habitually

either ingressive or effective meaning, is on the whole less helpful than that of the imperfect, for though the examples of its ingressive force are generally convincing (e.g. *ἔμαρψε*, 'seized,' *ἔμαρπτε*, 'held'; *ἤψατο*, 'touched,' *ἤπτετο*, 'clung to'; *ἐκάλυψε*, 'put as a covering,' or 'fell as a covering on,' *ἐκάλυπτε*, 'kept covered'; *ἐδάμασε*, 'brought into subjection,' *ἐδάμνα*, 'held in subjection'), those of the effective meaning, on the other hand, are frequently very forced—e.g. *ἔκηε* is taken to mean 'consumed by fire'; *ἐνίψε*, 'washed clean'; *ἐδίδαξε*, 'made proficient'; *ἐθαψε*, 'completed the burying of.' Would it not suffice in these, as in many other examples, to explain the aorist as purely 'complexive'—i.e. as *summing-up* the action as occurring in the past, *implying* therefore both the initial and the final points in the action, but *stressing* neither? In this way φ 224 and 225 can easily be explained; the poet begins the narrative of the scene with the descriptive imperfect, *ἐκύνεον*, but thinks it sufficient to continue with a dry statement of fact, *ἔκυσσεν*. Similar examples are *ἐρέω τοῦ σ' εἵνεκα δεῦρο κάλεσσα* (Ω 106) versus *ἐξ ἀγορῆς ἐκάλει Ἀντιφατῆα* (κ 114), or *μηρί' ἔκηα* (Θ 240) as compared with *καίε δ' ἐπὶ σχίζῃς ὁ γέρον* (Α 462).

It should also be noticed that Mutzbauer often omits to take into account other elements in the sentence which help to bring about the effective meaning—e.g. the *κατὰ* in some of the *καίω* examples, and the *ἀπὸ χρωτὸς* with *νίψεν* in K 575, which gives to the aorist the meaning 'removed by washing.'

On the other hand it can scarcely be denied that there are aorists in which the effective meaning is indisputable—e.g. *ἤλασε*, 'struck'; *ἤλυξε*, 'escaped'; *πρήξαι*, 'bring to accomplishment' (*πρήξαι δ' ἔμπης οὐ τι δυνήσεται*, A 562).

As regards the future, the theory of distinction of meaning, based upon difference in stem-formation, surely breaks down if one and the same future can have, as is admitted, both continuous and momentary meanings? (e.g. *κλαύσομαι*, into which the meaning, 'strike up the lament for the dead' is forced in X 87, *οὐ σ' ἔτ' ἐγώ γε*

κλαύσομαι ἐν λεχέεσσι, that of 'carry on the lamentation' admitted in Σ 340 (*κλαύσομαι νόκτας τε καὶ ἡμέματα*).

The book is not wholly free from misprints, but this, in such an overwhelming number of examples, is perhaps hardly surprising.

E. PURDIE.

A LITERARY HISTORY OF ROME.

A Literary History of Rome from the Origins to the Close of the Golden Age. By J. WIGHT DUFF, M.A. London and Leipzig: T. Fisher Unwin, 1909. Pp. xvi+695. 12s. 6d. net.

BOTH as a scientific historian and as a sympathetic judge of literature Professor Wight Duff shows great ability in this, the latest volume of *The Library of Literary History*. He writes with an aim—to insist throughout upon the distinctively Roman character of Roman literature at every stage in its development, in spite of the powerful influence exercised by Greek writers. Hence he lays great stress upon the 'influence of environment'; an attempt is made to show the relation between Roman literature and the geographical features of Italy, the ethnology of its inhabitants and the phases of its history. Hence also due attention is paid to the lives of the Roman writers, with their political and social surroundings. In brief, it is never forgotten that literature is the expression of a people's life.

The book is thoroughly up to date, and incorporates the results of recent philological and historical research. It is written in a style which commands admiration for its lucidity, terseness, and vigour. The literary judgments are based upon wide and careful study, and are marked by scholarly insight and loving enthusiasm for the subject. Particularly attractive are the appreciations of Ennius, Plautus, and Catullus, and the illuminating description of the Plautine stage on p. 158. The translation of specimen passages are generally distinguished by their fidelity, vigour, and good taste; the renderings of *Vivamus mea Lesbia and Lugete, o veneres cupidinesque* (pp. 319, 320) are perfect, and tempt a reviewer to quota-

tion. Once or twice, it is true, the point of a sentence seems to be missed. For instance, on p. 142, 'Point the path out to another which themselves they cannot see,' is surely an inadequate rendering of 'Qui sibi semitam non sapiunt, alteri monstrant viam.' The prose translations, although delightfully vigorous, are scarcely equal to the essays in verse; an example is the speech from the *Bellum Ingurthinum* on p. 419, which is marred by slight but quite unnecessary deviations from the original. These blemishes, however, do not spoil the great beauty of the work as a whole.

Literary criticisms are necessarily personal, but those of Professor Wight Duff nearly always commend themselves because of their good sense and freedom from prejudice. Such errors of judgment as occur are generally concerned with matter and not with form; Lucretius, for instance, does not deserve the praise bestowed upon him (pp. 287-294) for his work as scientist and philosopher. There is little science or philosophy in the *De rerum natura* that had not been part of the commonplaces of the schools for many years before Lucretius wrote.

The reviewer laid aside this book with two regrets. It is a pity that University students do not, as a rule, study such excellent works as that of Professor Wight Duff, but are satisfied with the scrappy 'introductions' generally prefixed to school editions of the classics. It is a pity, too, that the author stopped at the end of the 'Golden Age,' and did not go on to discuss Tacitus, Juvenal, and Martial.

W. H. S. JONES.

St. Catharine's College, Cambridge.

PAULYS REAL-ENCYCLOPÄDIE DER CLASSISCHEN ALTERTUMS- WISSENSCHAFT.

Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Neue Bearbeitung . . . herausgegeben von G. Wissowa. XII^{ter}. Halbband, Euxantios—Fornaces. Stuttgart: Metzler. 1909.

THE present half volume (completing the sixth volume) differs from its predecessors

in that its interest is mainly Latin or Roman, an obvious result of its being chiefly concerned with the letter F. Among the more important articles are those on 'Exercitus,' by Liebenam, giving a general summary of the development and organisation of the Roman army; 'Fabel,' by Hausrath, dealing with Aisopos, and deciding the question of the relations between India and Greece in favour of the priority of the latter; 'Fasti,' by Wissowa and Schoen; 'Finsternisse,' by Boll, with a useful chronological list of eclipses from 772 B.C. ? to A.D. 592; 'Fiscus,' by Rostowtzev; and 'Flavius,' including the three Emperors, by Weynand. We have noted in turning the pages a few minute points which may as well be recorded here. 'Exagium:' besides the solitary weight cited from Pernice, numerous others are identified as 'exagia' or 'solidi,' e.g. Dalton, *Catalogue of Early Christian Antiquities*, nos. 426 (marked S for solidus), 427 ff. (marked N for νόμισμα). The word does not seem to be confined to weights equivalent to a solidus. 'Fackel:' the too-ingenuous identification of the cross-torch, especially associated with Demeter, with a *groma* (*Arch. Anzeiger*, 1899, 131), should have been mentioned, by way of warning. 'Faustinianae puellae' deserved an article. 'Fenestra:' the last report from Corbridge was of course not available when this was written; in the next supplement the remains of a mullion there found should be noted. 'Fensernia:' the latest writer on the subject is A. Sambon, in his *Monnaies ant. de l'Italie*, pp. 307 ff. The long, and in many respects useful, article on 'Flussgötter' (Waser) would have been still more valuable had the writer made more reference to the British Museum Catalogue of Coins. He would then not have omitted such streams as the Limyros and the Hippophoras; he would have seen that the Senaros (if indeed such a form exists at all and is not a mere misreading) and the Sindros are probably the same Phrygian stream; that the Tembris was also known at Midaieon as the Tembros; not to speak of other points. In mentioning the figures of the Tiber and the Nile from the Baths of Constantine now on the Capitol before the steps of the Palazzo del Senatore, he omits to record

the fact that the Tiber was in ancient times a Tigris, the Wolf and Twins being a restoration of the sixteenth century. Dealing with the figure of a bull on coins commemorating Empedocles' sanitation of the city of Selinus, he prefers, to the idea that it represents the sacrifice offered on the occasion, the explanation that it represents the fury of the now conquered streams. That is nearly but not quite all the true explanation; the fact that the bull stands on a pedestal shows that it is a monument erected at the time, presumably as an atonement for the summary method which Empedocles employed to get rid of the divine nuisance. Did space permit we might discuss many other points in this interesting article.

G. F. HILL.

British Museum, London.

IMMISCH'S ARISTOTELIS POLITICA.

Aristotelis Politica post Fr. Susemihlium recognovit Otto Immisch. Leipzig: B. G. TEUBNER. 1909. 8vo. Pp. xxxix + 354. Price M. 3.

THE texts of the *Politics* produced by that great Aristotelian Fr. Susemihl tended to ignore the needs and the convenience of the average student, and the average student should be correspondingly grateful to M. Immisch for having un-Susemihlised the text again so thoroughly as is here done. Speaking broadly, the text here presented is the plain undoctored tradition of the MSS., complicated by no theories of transposition and interpolation; and what is more, it is presented in the traditional order of the books, I' followed by Δ not H. Such reversions may displease the unco pedantic, but a Teubner editor has to consult the convenience of a wider world. Another interesting point: M. Immisch is not straight-laced in the matter of orthography; he allows, for instance, οὐθείς to stand side by side with οὐδεῖς, αἰεὶ with αἰεί: which policy, as he observes, 'secutus est nuper Hicksius in egregia Psychologiae editione.'

In his views regarding the various fami-

lies of MSS. and their inter-relations—a matter to which a good deal of the 'præfatio' is naturally devoted—M. Immisch differs at some points from Susemihl; but it would seem that the rather obscure problems raised have not yet received a final solution. With regard to textual details, the editor makes a fair number of new conjectures, e.g. 1253²⁶ <κρείττων δ'> ἂ τε περ; 1285⁹ ἐν τινι ἐλάσει (for βασιλείᾳ); 1294¹⁵ εἶδος καλλοπίζεται (for καλείται); 1298¹ πρόκριτοι for αἰρετοί; 1330²⁶ προσάντην for πρὸς αὐτήν. He also admits into his text, or mentions in his footnotes, a judicious selection of emendations by others. Thus it will interest English readers to observe that the names of Congreve, Well-don, Newman, occur not infrequently. Newman's προεστός (for πλήθος) at 1331⁴ is adopted; Jackson's δοκεῖ που (for δοκίμω) is printed at 1277²⁶; the punctuation suggested by Wyse at 1326³⁹, and that suggested by Postgate at 1328²⁵, are followed. Amongst places where the traditional text is left to stand, although some change seems needed and various conjectures are recorded, are the following: 1253³⁵ φρονήσει καὶ ἀρετῇ, where it may be worth while to suggest, for ἀρετῇ, ἀνδρείᾳ, assuming that the corruption occurred from the loss of the first two letters; 1257³⁷ εὐμεταχείριστον πρὸς τὸ ζῆν, where it is not easy to propose a substitute for ζῆν (? possibly ἰσάνασι, 'for weighing'); 1259³¹ τὸ μέντοι ὄραμα θάλαω, where the original may have been σόφισμα; 1299¹² οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον μὲν δεῖ δ' ὑπάρχειν, where λείψι may be suggested as an easy and appropriate correction of δεῖ; 1301⁴⁶ οἱ τρόποι . . . τοῖς εἰρημένοις, where I should be inclined to fill the gap with <ἰσόρροποι>; 1327¹⁶ περὶ . . . λιμένων καὶ πόλεων, where τεύχεων for πόλεων would not be, in uncials, a violent change (cf. "25); 1342¹⁷, τοῖς τοιούτοις μέλεισι θετέον τοῖς . . . ἀγωνιστάς, where ἐθιστέον may be proposed as a suitable correction of θετέον. These are specimens of places where M. Immisch does not appear to have said quite the last word; but none the less he has given us here a very sound and judicious piece of editing.

R. G. BURY.

Trumpington, Cambridge.

NEOPLATONISM IN RELATION
TO CHRISTIANITY.

Neoplatonism in Relation to Christianity. An essay. By C. ELSEE, M.A. University Press, Cambridge. 1908. 8vo. Vol. I. Pp. vii + 144.

THIS book contains in expanded—and somewhat belated—form the Hulsean Prize Essay of 1901. Its five chapters deal with 'Roman Religion in the Third Century,' 'Earlier Systems of Greek Philosophy,' 'The First Beginnings of Christian Philosophy,' 'The History of Neoplatonism,' and 'The Relations between Neoplatonism and Christianity.' To use up two chapters out of five in preliminaries and to wander so far afield as Thales and Heraclitus may seem unnecessary, but Mr. Elsee tells his tale pleasantly and gets his information from modern and reliable sources, English and French. When he gets to business, it is, of course, Clement and Origen, Philo and Plotinus, that he is most concerned with; but although he has a good deal to say about them that is true and just, he has little to say that is new, unless it be his contention that Plotinus 'edited and retouched Christian theology in the light of Platonic philosophy,' and that the silence of Plotinus, the plagiarist, upon the subject of Christianity 'was deliberate and intentional': Neoplatonism, in fact, was merely part and parcel of an anti-Christian plot! The weakest part of the Essay is that which deals with what one might suppose to be the essential point—the characteristic differences between the two theologies, and the influence of the one on the other.

R. G. BURY.

Trumpington, Cambridge.

DIE BURGTEMPEL DER ATHE-
NAIA.

Die Burgtempel der Athenaia. By E. PETERSEN. Berlin: Weidmann. 1907. 8vo. 1 vol. Pp. 147, with 4 Illustrations in text. M. 4.

DR. PETERSEN here endeavours to set forth without bias evidence offered by writers and monuments. He discusses first the earliest

written witnesses for the primitive temple, Homer's mention of Ἐρεχθῆος πυκινὸν δόμον of η. 80 in conjunction with the passage in B. 546 ff. where Erechtheus is said to dwell in the temple of Athene (ἐνὶ πύλῳ νηῶ), and shows that the words νηὸς and δόμος are well chosen, since Erechtheus really had his dwelling at Athens, while Athene only had the seat of her worship there. He next discusses the reliefs of the primitive temple, the oldest cult-statues of the goddess worshipped at Athens, and the connection between Erechtheus and Poseidon. The goddess of the early temple had nothing to do with the Homeric Athene, but belonged purely to Athens and Attica, and was therefore not likely to be represented as a war-like figure. Erechtheus, as her foster-son, was granted an abode in her temple, and she herself dwelt in his house, nor is there any trace of opposition or a contest between them. The whole story of Athene's strife with Poseidon was later than the earliest temple on the Acropolis, and the original Athene was an 'agrarian' goddess; indeed, one may even believe that in very early times there was no sculptured representation of the goddess, who was held to be immanent in the sacred olive-tree, and who was probably worshipped under the name of Pandrosos. It is probable, too, that in the most primitive times Erechtheus held the position later occupied by Zeus. A section on the new Erechtheion follows, and lastly, the cella of Athene Polias is treated at some length, where, after elaborate calculations concerning the measurements of the παρὰ τὰς, the author decides in favour of a standing figure.

E. S. FEGAN.

PHIDIAS ET LA SCULPTURE
GRECQUE AU V^e SIÈCLE.

Phidias et la Sculpture grecque au V^e Siècle. By H. LECHAT. (Les Maîtres de l'Art Series.) Paris: Rouam. 8vo. 1 vol. Pp. 174. 24 plates.

PROFESSOR LECHAT has written an excellent little volume on Pheidias for the series entitled 'Les Maîtres de l'Art,' embracing also the sculpture of the whole of the fifth

century. It is a task which has been attempted many times, but the vigour, freshness, and truth with which the various statues are described show great sympathy with, and delight in, the works of these masters, and bring the very gods and goddesses before our eyes. As specially good we may mention the description of the pediments at Olympia, of the Nike of Paionios, and the estimate of the three Athenes of Pheidias. Very interesting, too, is the comparison of the two great Doric temples—that of Zeus at Olympia and the Parthenon at Athens—where the professor points out the close correspondence between the spirit of the architecture and the decoration; while, later, in discussing the influence of Pheidias upon Polykleitos, he compares the Doryphoros with the Doric of the temple at Olympia, and the Diadumenos with the Doric of the Parthenon. The characteristics of the Ionian school are neatly put in a few lines; its 'naturelle facilité de bavardage' may be traced even from the archaic period. The difference between the work of Pheidias and those who came after him lies in the fact that Pheidias and his most distinguished contemporaries were a kind of summing-up and crowning-point of the traditions of their respective schools, while their successors were individualists; it was the novelties introduced by their individual minds that formed the essential features of their art. The glory of Pheidias lay in his power to assimilate all that had gone before him, and to bring it forth enriched by his own spirit. The most renowned of his statues were those of the divinities, for in them he made a real contribution to the religious beliefs of his time, so that he was said to have added to religion by showing the beauty and the majesty of the gods.

E. S. FEGAN.

LA COLONNE TORSE ET LE DÉCOR EN
HÉLICE DANS L'ART ANTIQUE.

La Colonne Torse et le Décor en Hélice dans l'Art antique. By V. CHAPOT. Paris: Leroux. 1907. 8vo. 1 vol. Pp. 176. Illustrations 210, in text.

DR. CHAPOT has made an exhaustive study of the twisted column, tracing its progress from the earliest

times until it fell into discredit after a temporary revival in the fifteenth century. He compares instances from Egypt, Assyria, India, Africa, the United States, Mexico, and Europe, but as Riegl has pointed out in his *Stilfragen*, the spiral is found occurring quite independently all over the world. Dr. Chapot leaves on one side as very doubtful all question of influences, and proceeds to examine the suggestions which have been offered to account for spiral decoration. Among these may be cited the natural desire to improve on a decoration formed of curved lines, imitations of floral forms or tree-trunks, festal garlands, snakes, ropes, and the twisted appearance of flames. In his remarks on the rope theory, Dr. Chapot describes a savage's method of making pottery by coiling down long strips of clay, much as a sailor would coil a rope. In this case the spiral obtained is an element of fabrication rather than of decoration.

Dr. Chapot himself seems to incline to the opinion that the spiral is in some way of religious significance, which would lend colour to the suggestion that the twisted column derived from festal garlands twisted round a pillar, in itself a cult object.

The last chapter contains a long list of examples of the *colonne torse* of the Christian era which have come down to our day, and of which we have some knowledge.

E. S. FEGAN.

MOMMSEN'S GESAMMELTE SCHRIFTEN.

Gesammelte Schriften von THEODOR MOMMSEN.

Dritter Band: juristische Schriften, dritter Band (xii and 632 pp., 1907); fünfter Band: historische Schriften, zweiter Band (vi and 617 pp., 1908). Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung. Lex. 8°. Each volume M. 15, or bound, M. 17.40.

THE first, second, and fourth volumes of this important publication were noticed in the *C.R.* for 1907 (vol. xxi., pp. 216 ff.). With the third volume the juristic writings are completed and indexed. The range of dates (from 1843 to 1904) and subjects is very wide, and I shall not try to describe the contents of the volume in full. To the present century belong the following essays: *Latium maius*; *Die Erblichkeit des Decurionats*; *Zur Lehre von den römischen Korporationen*; *Nexum*; *Mancipium, manceps, praes, praedium*; *Zur Geschichte der Erbpacht*; *Die Popularklagen*; *Die Pilatus-Acten*; *Die Rechtsverhältnisse des Apostels Paulus*. The reader who is no jurist will find his account in the last, and in the discussion of the usury of M. Brutus, which throws light on some passages of Cicero's letters and gives Mommsen another fling at Cicero: 'He belongs to the neuters who shrink, not from wrong, but from its nakedness; who have at heart the reputation of honesty, not honesty itself.' The paper on St. Paul, reprinted from a German theological journal, should be read by all serious students of the Acts. It is chiefly concerned with the Apostle's rights before the law, but incident

ally many other points are discussed (as, for example, the question of the double name, Σαῦλος ὁ καὶ Παῦλος), and Mommsen's judgment of the Acts as a whole is revealed.

The second volume of the historical papers deals chiefly with the topography of Rome and Italy, Roman Switzerland, the *limes*, and points of provincial organisation. None of the articles seems to belong to any year later than 1900, but attention may be called to the fragment entitled, 'Die römische Provinzialautonomie,' which was printed in *Hermes* after the author's death, and especially to the hitherto unpublished essay on Boden- und Geldwirtschaft der römischen Kaiserzeit, an important contribution to the economic history of the early empire, 'apparently intended,' say the editors, 'for the fourth volume of the *History of Rome*.'

E. HARRISON.

THE ROMANCE OF ALEXANDER.

Der griechische Alexanderroman. Von ADOLF AUSFELD. Nach des Verfassers Tode herausgegeben von WILHELM KROLL. Leipzig: Teubner. 1907. 8vo. Pp. xii+251. M. 8.

NOT the least attractive part of this interesting book is the short biography of its author which is prefixed to it. The combination of Germanic and classical studies, to which he devoted his life, found expression in a series of articles upon the mediæval tradition of the great king. Ausfeld seems to have delayed the composition of his chief work in the hope that the most important Greek manuscripts of the pseudo-Callisthenes would be edited again, since he was unable to rely upon C. Müller's text. But he hoped in vain, and died leaving his work unfinished. Fortunately, however, Mr. Bernays and Mr. Kroll have prepared his manuscript for the press.

Ausfeld was a practical teacher, and his work is eminently helpful. It contains a translation into German of what he conceived to be the essential contents of the oldest tradition of the *Romance*, and to this he has subjoined a scholarly commentary. But until the appearance of the edition which Mr. Kroll has promised of the Greek text it will be premature to attempt a detailed criticism. Ausfeld refers the authorship of the original form of the *Romance* to an Alexandrian who lived about the time of Ptolemy Epiphanes, and traces his hand especially in the story of the birth of Alexander, and in the successive humiliations of the pride of Darius (p. 216). Upon this foundation varied materials were laid until the whole work passed into the mediæval tradition. It is noteworthy that the *Romance* contains some contributions to our knowledge. For example, to the question, 'What is the meanest creature?' the *Romance* gives the answer, 'Man.' 'How so?' 'Ask yourself.' Plutarch has entirely misunderstood this (Alex. 64). Again, there is a valuable description of the foundation of Alexandria (i. 31-

33). But, on the whole, the story gives a distorted picture of the king. Such as it is, however, it replaced for a thousand years the truer narratives of Curtius, Arrian, and Plutarch. Like most popular history, it was tempered with the characteristics of those among whom it grew up.

Nevertheless, Ausfeld's book is of importance also for our own Middle English literature. At the beginning of the fourteenth century a Kentish writer translated a French version of the *Romance* into beautiful English rhymes. Alexander passes into the hero of chivalry. It was as the coming of Alexander that the near accession of Henry V. was greeted in the court of his dying father. Any lover of our older literature can multiply examples such as these.

Yet the Macedonian king was far greater than even the knight of the mediæval legends, and Ausfeld's work enables us once more to estimate the service done to human life by the revival of classical learning.

FRANK GRANGER.

University College, Nottingham.

DE CODICE AENIPONTANO 579 QUO CONTINETUR OUIDI REMEDIA AMORIS.

De codice Aenipontano 579 quo continetur Ouidi Remedia Amoris, scripsit J. LECHNER. (Commentationes Aenipontanae quas edunt E. Kalinka et A. Zingerle, iv. pp. 17-104.) Ad Aeni Pontem, in aedibus Wagnerianis, 1909.

'Quæ cum ita sint, ullum pretium peculiare lectionibus huius codicis Ouidianis tribui posse negandum est.' After filling eighty-three large pages with description and collation the author arrives at this conclusion—that a MS. written in 1451 is, as one might expect it to be, quite worthless. Then he fills three pages more. Printing would seem to be cheap at Innsbruck, or money plentiful.

POPULÄRE AUFSÄTZE.

Populäre Aufsätze. Von KARL KRUMBACHER. Teubner. M. 6. Cloth, M. 7.

IN this book Krumbacher collects his scattered papers. Many of them deal with modern Greek subjects. The first, 'Das Problem der neugriechischen Schriftsprache,' has already become well known; besides this, there are papers on modern Greek literature, on Psicharis, on the Evangelical School in Smyrna (where is a good museum of antiquities), and on Byzantium. There are also historical papers, and several on miscellaneous subjects. The book is interesting and alive. We would call attention to a notable passage on translation in his essay on Psicharis (pp. 120-121). Speaking of a novel that Psicharis wrote in Greek and then translated into French, he remarks, that although the circumstances could not be more favourable, the author and the translator being one, and he speak-

ing both languages from his childhood, even so something of the charm of the original is lost in the translation: 'so mighty is the psychological difference in languages.' In speaking of certain of

Psicharis' compositions, Krumbacher makes a word which deserves to live. 'These,' he says, 'are not Psychologism, but Nebulism.' We welcome the title for a certain class of English novels.

TRANSLATION

ALEXIS. I rejoice that it's decided:

Happy now will be his life;
For my father is provided
With a true and tender wife.

ENSEMBLE. She will tend him, nurse him,
mend him,

Air his linen, dry his tears.
Bless the thoughtful fates that send
him
Such a wife to soothe his years!

No young giddy thoughtless maiden,
Full of graces, airs and jeers,
But a sober widow, laden
With the weight of fifty years.

SIR MARMADUKE. No high-born exacting
beauty,
Blazing like a jewelled sun,
But a wife who'll do her duty
As that duty should be done!

MRS. PARTLET. I'm no saucy minx and
giddy—
Hussies such as them abound;
But a clean and tidy widdy
Well bekown for miles around.

W. S. GILBERT (*The Sorcerer*).

A. ὅσα δὴ 'πὶ τούτοις τὸ κέαρ ἠὺφράνθη
ἐγώ.

ὁ γέρων γὰρ ἤδη δαιμόνων ἔξει βίον.
πιστὸν δ' ἔοικεν, ἢ πορίζεται πατρὶ
τὸ χρῆμα τῆς γυναικὸς ἀπαλὸν δ' αὖ τόδε.
Πάντες, καὶ μὴν θεραπεύσει τόνδε τολυνεύσει
ἅμα

θαίματ' αὖ δ' ἐκπλύνουσ' ἀποψήσει καλῶς—
—τὰ δάκρυα τάνδρός. πῶς δ' ἄρ' οὐ
θεοῖς χάριν
νον/βυστικῶς δίδουσι τοιαύτην τρόφον
ἄγειν δίκαιον;

B. οὐ γὰρ ἦν ἀβελτέρα,
οὐδ' ὥς κόρη τις ἐγγελῶσα θρύπτεται,
σεμνὴ, τρυφῶσα, τοῦ δὲ πάρος μνήμων
λέχους
τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον μετρίως φιλεῖν δοκεῖ,
καλῶς φέρονσα δὴ τὰ πεντήκοντ' ἔτη.
M. βδελύττομαι γὰρ ἐγκεκοισυρημένας
γυναῖκας—ἥ τις καταχέασ' ὅζει μύρον—
'λαμπροὺς δυνάστας ἐμπρέποντας'—οἰκία.
ἀλλ' ἦδε ταμειόουσα διατελεῖ σοφῶς
ὡς χρὴν ταμειεῖν τῶνδον.

II. ἀμέλει, τοῦθ' ἄλις.
τῶν γὰρ ματαίων οὐχὶ παιδισκῶν ἐγώ,
τῶν πετομένων, ὧν ἔστι πλεῖν ἢ μύρια.
οὐκ· ἀλλὰ γύναιον κοσμίως ἐσταλμένον,
ἦν οἶδεν Ἑλλὰς χῶ Κολωνὸς σῶφρονα.

H. L. HENDERSON.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Publishers and Authors forwarding Books for review are asked to send at the same time a note of the price.

* * * *Excerpts and Extracts from Periodicals and Collections are not included in these Lists unless stated to be separately published.*

ἀντὶ μᾶς. An Essay in Isometry. By R. J. Walker.
In two vols. London: Macmillan and Co.
1910. 9" x 5½". Pp. vi + 507 + 394. Cloth, 21s.
net.

Apuleius (The Metamorphoses of) Translated by
H. E. Butler. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon
Press. 1910. 7" x 4½". Pp. 192 + 176. Cloth,
3s. 6d. net (\$1.00) each.

- Archæology* (American Journal of) Vol. XIII., No. 4. With four plates. Norwood, Mass.: The Norwood Press; New York: The Macmillan Co. 1909. $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6\frac{1}{4}''$. Pp. 147. \$1.50.
- Aristophanes, Acharnians*. The Greek Text. Revised, with a translation into corresponding metres, introduction, and commentary by B. B. Rogers. London: George Bell and Sons. 1910. $9'' \times 7''$. Pp. lix + 237 + xii. Cloth, 10s. 6d.
- Bury* (J. B.) *The Constitution of the Later Roman Empire* (Creighton Memorial Lecture). Cambridge University Press. 1910. $7\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5''$. Pp. 50. Cloth, 1s. 6d. net.
- Detleson* (D.) *Die Entdeckung des germanischen Nordens im Altertum* (Quellen und Forschungen zur alten Geschichte und Geographie, Heft 8). Berlin: Weidmann. 1910. $10'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. 18. Pf. 60.
- Heidel* (William Arthur) *Περὶ Φύσεως*, A Study of the Conception of Nature among the Pre-Socratics. Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Vol. XLV., No. 4, January, 1910. Boston, Mass.: Published by the Academy. $9\frac{3}{4}'' \times 6''$. Pp. 77-153. \$1.00.
- Harrod* (S. G.) *Latin Terms of Endearment and of Family Relationships: A Lexicographical Study based on Vol. VI. of the Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* (Doctor's Dissertation). Princeton, 1909. $9\frac{3}{4}'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. xii + 92.
- Juvenal*. See Ratti.
- Lateinische Grammatik*. Laut- und Formenlehre, Syntax und Stilistik, von Dr. Friedrich Stolz und J. H. Schmalz. Mit einem Anhang über Lateinische Lexicographia von Dr. Ferdinand Heerdigen. Vierte Auflage. Handbuch der Klassischen Altertums-wissenschaft. Zweiter Band. 2 Abteilung. München: Oskar Beck, 1910. $10'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. xvi + 779. M. 15; cloth, M. 17.50.
- Lucretius* (on the Nature of Things) Translated by Cyril Bailey. With six diagrams. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1910. $7'' \times 4\frac{1}{4}''$. Pp. 312. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net (\$1.00).
- Mommsen* (Theodor) *Gesammelte Schriften*. Siebenter Band, Philologische Schriften. Berlin: Weidmann. 1909. $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. xii. + 825. M. 20.
- Philologisch-Historischen Klasse* (Sächsischen Gesellschaft). 27 vols. (I.) *Ethische Werte bei Aristoteles* (Max Heinze). M. 1.20. (III.) *Zur Würdigung der grammatischen Arbeiten Varros* (Georg Goetz). M. 1. (VI.) *Die Römischen sogenannten Dreissig Tyrannen* (Hermann Peter). M. 1.80. (IX.) *Ein Ostrakon* (Richard Meister). M. 1.60. (XI.) *Zum Recht von Gortyns* (Hermann Lipsius). M. 1. (XII.) *Hektors Abschied* (Erich Bethe). M. 1.20. (XVI.) *Aristoteles über das Steigen des Nil* (J. Partsch). M. 2. (XXII.) *Griechische Satyrspielreliefs* (Theodor Schreiber). M. 1.60. (XXIII.) *Zum Alexandrinischen Antisemitismus* (Ulrich Wilcken). M. 2.40. (XXV.) *Die Ägyptischen Gaue und ihre politische Entwicklung* (Georg Steindorff). M. 1.60. (XXVI.) *Zur Ara Pacis* (Franz Studniczka). M. 3.60. (XXVII.) *Ciceros Politische Anfänge* (Richard Heinze). M. 2.60. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner. 1909. $11\frac{1}{4}'' \times 7\frac{1}{2}''$.
- Plato*. Vol. I. *Platon sein Leben, sein Schriften, seine Lehre*. Erster Band von Constantin Ritter. München: Oskar Beck. 1909. $8\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. xv + 588. M. 8; cloth, M. 9.
- Plato*. *Neue Untersuchungen über Platon*, von Constantin Ritter. München: Oskar Beck. 1910. $9'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. viii + 424. M. 12; cloth, M. 14.
- Preuschen* (Dr. Erwin) *Handwörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments*. Siebente Lieferung. Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann. 1910. $11'' \times 7\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. viii + 962-1183. M. 2.40.
- Ratti* (A.) *Reliquie di antico codice Bobbiense ritrovate*. Estratto del volume *Miscellanea Ceriani*. Milan: Hoepli. 1910. $9'' \times 6\frac{1}{4}''$. Pp. 22, 8 plates.
- Ratti* (A.) *Reliquie di un antico codice delle Satire di Giovenale ritrovate nell' Ambrosiana*. Rendiconti del R. Inst. Lomb. di Sc. e Lett., Serie II., Vol. XLII., 1909. Pp. 8, 3 plates.
- Seneca*. *Physical Science in the Time of Nero* (a translation of *Quaestiones Naturales*). By John Clarke. With notes on the treatise by Sir Archibald Geikie. London: Macmillan and Co. 1910. $9'' \times 5\frac{3}{4}''$. Pp. liv + 368. Cloth, 10s. net.
- Snow* (T. C.) *How to save Greek, and other Paradoxes of Oxford Reform*. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, and London: Simpkin, Marshall. 1910. $7\frac{1}{4}'' \times 5''$. Pp. 86. Paper boards, 2s. net.
- Stobaei* (Johannis) *Anthologium*. Pecensuerunt Curtius Wachsmuth et Otto Hense. Vol. IV. Berlin: Weidmann. 1909. $8'' \times 5''$. Pp. xiii + 675. M. 20.
- Williams* (R. A.) *Uniformity in Languages and Language Study: with special reference to the Interim Report of the Joint Committee on Grammatical Terminology*. By R. A. Williams, D.Litt. Dublin University Press. 1910. $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6''$. Pp. 46.
- Zavitzianou* (Sp. K.) *περὶ Νηψίματος ἡτοῦ πῶς ἐγένετο, πῶς γίνεταί, καὶ πῶς πρέπει νὰ γίνεταί ἡ καθαρσιότης τοῦ ἀτόμου. ὑπὸ Σ. Κ. Ζ. Ιατροῦ. Ἐν Κερκύρα. Α. Λάριτσα, 1909. 8'' x 6''. Pp. xviii + 368.*